



NEW ECONOMY DEVELOPMENT GROUP
Le Groupe Éconov Développement

**INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE
CANADIAN PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM**

EXTERNAL REVIEW

FINAL REPORT

**Prepared for
International Development Research Centre**

**Prepared by
Dal Brodhead and Wendy Quarry
New Economy Development Group**

December 7, 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) was established by an Act of Parliament in 1970. The Act defines the Centre's mandate and purpose as one that is focused on initiating and supporting research into the problems of developing regions of the world. The Canadian Partnerships Program (CP) was initiated in 1992. It is part of IDRC's Special Initiatives Division (SID) and is unique in that it is directly responsive to proposals from Canadian researchers and actors in civil society.

In keeping with IDRC's focus as a learning organization, an external evaluation of each Program is now undertaken every five years. This Review is however, the first external evaluation of the Canadian Partnerships Program. The purpose of an external review is to broaden the Centres' understanding of issues of importance to the Board of Governors, staff, management and partners as a way of supplementing the corporate knowledge about the scope, characteristics and effectiveness of its support in order to inform the design and monitoring of future projects. In order to accomplish this task, this Review included a document review and an initial sample of 74 selected projects. However the review team was only able to locate key informant for 57 out of original 74 included in the sample, Interviews were carried out with a total of 72 key partners and grant recipients, as well as program and other IDRC staff. Data collection was completed by an on-line survey of all 315 grant recipients funded during the Review period of 2005-2010. A total of 76 responded to the survey.

The overall findings of the Review indicate that the Canadian Partnerships Program plays an important role with the international development research and development community across Canada and within the International Development Research Centre. There is no doubt that in general the CP Program is meeting its global objective of ensuring that IDRC has an active presence in the Canadian international development (ID) research community. It has also substantially met its own five specific objectives:

- it has built and maintained long term relationships with key Canadian institutions
- it has strengthened the capacity and engagement of Canadian universities and civil society organizations in ID
- it has facilitated and strengthened Canada-Global South connections
- it has increased the number of Canadians learning about and engaging in ID
- it has contributed to the Centre's vision with respect to Canadian institutions.

The Review found that the wide range of relationships established by CP across the country helps keep the Centre grounded within the Canadian reality. Its open-ended, flexible and responsive approach also provides an ideal breeding ground for innovation. It is distinct from other IDRC Program Initiatives (PI) which focus on sectoral issues in that its main objective is to build and maintain relationships with the Canadian international research and development community. Nevertheless, CP does fit squarely within the ambit of the IDRC mandate. Unstated and less understood, is the importance that this distinctive role plays within the organization. There continues to be a need for a part of IDRC that is not programmatic – a place that can respond with flexibility – where something new can be tried and innovation is encouraged. Thus, the Review has concluded that CP plays a valuable role with limited financial and human resources. CP should be continued as an IDRC investment with some adjustments in the future.

It became evident to the Review Team that the Program is at a change point as the external context has evolved since its inception. Increased immigration, changing perspectives on security in the post 9/11 era, and the growing internationalism of Canadian universities have contributed to this change. In addition, seasoned CP staff members are retiring and the strong ties which they have established between the Centre and the Canadian research and development community should be revisited. CP needs to learn

from its past experience and configure itself for the future. However, preserving the flexibility of the Program will also be essential and resources need to be reserved for that purpose.

The CP Program has accomplished a great deal – that is clear. It is also evident that the developmental phase of CP has come to an end. It now needs to be shaped based on strategic thinking guided by emerging international development priorities and the changing dynamics within Canada. The Review Team found that CP's global objectives remain appropriate and valuable, but that the Program needs to reach out further afield in Canada to locate potentially interested players from a diversity of backgrounds and geographic locations, thus correcting the current imbalance which favours Central Canada. Some ideas that have been mentioned during the Review include engaging Community Colleges across Canada and increasing contacts with the multi-cultural and diaspora communities. The Review Team also found that in the context of networking with CP support, Canadian universities have managed to partner with a number of interesting NGOs in the South, but they have largely ignored interesting, innovative activity undertaken by Canadian NGOs.

In terms of CP's objectives, the Review Team was challenged by their breadth and the Program's lack of identified outcome indicators. It is time to become more specific about what the CP Program actually hopes to achieve with its relationships. Based upon its experience, it should consider identifying more clearly its strategies, as well as specifying indicators in order to move towards delineating a theory of change which would underpin its resource allocations.

It will be important to build upon success. One of the great successes of the CP Program has been its ability to provide small amounts of funding for a diverse range of activity. The Review Team was frequently informed of the value of this funding to both Northern and Southern partners which encouraged innovation, a measured degree of risk taking and great flexibility and responsiveness. Partner after partner emphasized the uniqueness of CP with its practical, non-bureaucratic processes, its respectful relationship building and its genuine interest in cultivating equitable partnerships. The value-added of CP staff whose encouragement enabled Northern and Southern partners to initiate new contacts and build and support networking, was frequently stressed by those interviewed or surveyed during the Review.

In reviewing the presence of CP across Canada, an unanticipated result of the current practices was an evident concentration of funding in a few Provinces. A future challenge for CP will be to extend beyond the current partners to involve other potentially interested universities and NGOs, as well as to reach out to new communities across Canada.

It was also apparent to the Review Team that there is a lack of clarity as to what the criteria are for eligibility for continuity of funding, other than for those organizations falling into the core or institutional partners categories. While CP did appear to have an implicit set of criteria to guide its actions, more explicit and public documentation should be made available to avoid any further confusion amongst current or future grant applicants or recipients.

CP has made a recognized and welcomed effort to build relationships and to avoid the bureaucracy which often accompanies grant applications and funding. Part of this equation has been a simplified reporting and accountability regime with requirements adjusted to the magnitude and complexity of grants and institutional arrangements. Core and institutional partners have been expected to undertake independent evaluations on a periodic basis. These evaluations were thorough and informative although not always outcome focussed. The vast majority of CP grants (as the tables show) were small and many were non-repetitive. In such cases, monitoring was done on a case by case basis by the Program officer when possible and evaluations were less detailed or in the case of the many smaller grants, not required. The Review Team has made a recommendation regarding the potential benefits of requesting more end of project self-evaluation reports except in the case of very small grants.

As the Review notes, there are many instructive and encouraging stories which could be obtained from even the smaller grant recipients and these should be gathered. A comprehensive communications strategy is needed by CP to make others aware of its uniqueness and availability.

As a consequence of the External Review of the Canadian Partnerships Program, the following recommendations are proposed:

Recommendation # 1 – Invest in the Future of the Canadian Partnership Approach

It is recommended that IDRC continue to invest in the Canadian Partnership Approach. The Review Team strongly supports the rationale for the CP Program and its role within the Centre. It is particularly impressed with the utility and effectiveness of the Program’s numerous small investments in Canadian NGO’s, universities and international development-focused organizations.

Recommendation 2 – Designate Project Priority Theme Areas

It is recommended that the present loosely defined project categories be replaced with theme areas that relate more closely to those that have emerged from the CP Program, such as climate change, food security, youth and the diaspora. Here the Review Team is not supporting the idea of CP restricting its priority areas solely to current IDRC themes. This, in our view, would obviate the future possibility of uncovering new and potentially interesting lines of inquiry. Targeted strategies need to be launched to realize specified outreach objectives.

Recommendation 3 – Develop “New” Canadian Partnership Strategies

It is recommended that CP work on a two track strategy, focused on both strengthening its long standing relationships, as well as actively developing designated theme areas including those it has already identified. The CP Program should also consider renewing its efforts to reach out to groups and institutions outside Central Canada.

Recommendation 4 – Improve Transparency in Selection

It is recommended that specific selection criteria for each project priority area should be defined to support greater transparency and for the sake of clarifying the confusion currently evident around the project eligibility and intake process. These priorities should be advertised publically and thus should be written with enough precision to shape the expectations of applicants and thus reduce the volume of proposals to manageable proportions. It is also recommended that the selection criteria and expectations for core partners be redefined to open the possibility for additional institutional participation.

Recommendation 5 – Stress Innovation & Flexibility

It is recommended that CP maintain the current diversity of projects while recognizing the role of small grants as a key part of the flexibility of the CP Program. Small grants encourage experimentation and risk-taking which is usually less feasible in large projects. They also greatly increase the constituency and numbers of CP partners served, in addition to the potential for enabling multi-sector collaboration and innovation while effectively managing risk.

Recommendation 6 – Implement Project Self-Evaluation

It is recommended that all grant recipients be asked to provide a self-evaluation of their work in relation to the relevant CP objectives. Its length and depth should be reasonable and commensurate with the size

of the allocation. This action would both enhance the quality of the projects and provide a simple measure of accountability.

Recommendation 7 – Encourage joint University – NGO Projects

It is recommended that the CP Program – in its next phase – should consider renewing its efforts to do something about the collaboration gap by ear-marking funding to encourage the development of joint projects between universities and Canadian NGOs by ear-marking funding to encourage the development of joint projects. Also CP should ensure that projects supported in universities address the practical needs of international development and that they incorporate student training whenever feasible.

Recommendation 8 – Initiate a CP Communication Strategy

It is recommended that a communication strategy for the “new” CP be created which disseminates the message internally and externally about the nature of CP, especially its uniqueness. It should stress the opportunities – the stories about effective partnerships, networking, knowledge-sharing and engagement, as well as its responsiveness and the North-South linkages enabled by the Program.

It is also recommended that in order to make the CP experience and its stories more accessible to those inside and outside IDRC, a reshaped project information management system which is more user-friendly is needed. Additionally, the nature of CP should be more clearly articulated and evident on the IDRC web site.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Review Team would like to acknowledge the openness and support of the IDRC Evaluation Unit and Canadian Partnerships staff towards the External Review exercise. The Team is particularly grateful to Colleen Duggan and Helene De Celles. Its thanks are also directed to the many willing CP partners who agreed to be interviewed and to the large number who responded to the survey.

The Review Team expresses its gratitude to its Advisor, Bill Found of Dalvorem International for his research, his interviewing and his willingness to provide input into the Report. Thanks also go to Guylaine Leclerc and Jane McNamara for their support to the Team.

ACRONYMS

APRM	Chair of the National Governing Council
AUCC	Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
CASID	Canadian Association for the Study of International Development
CCASLS	Canadian Council of Area Studies Learned Societies
CCGH	Canadian Coalition for Global Health
CCIC	Canadian Council for International Co-operation
CEBEM	Bolivian Centre for Multidisciplinary Studies
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIGI	Center for International Governance Innovation
CP	Canadian Partnership Program
CUSO	Canadian University Services Overseas now Voluntary Service Overseas
EU	Evaluation Unit
GPI	Genuine Progress Index
HURIDOCs	Human Rights Information and Documentation Systems
ID	International development
IDRC	International Development Research Centre (The Centre)
IDS	International Development Research Studies
IISD	International Institute of Sustainable Development
LACREG	Canada-Latin America and the Caribbean Research Exchange Grants
New Economy	New Economy Development Group Inc.
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NSI	North South Institute
MCC	Mennonite Central Committee Canada
PAC	Partnership Africa Canada
PAD	Project Approval Documents
PAR	Participatory Action Research
PI	Program Initiative
Review	External Review of Canadian Partnership Program
RRGA	Research Related Grant Agreements
RSGA	Research Support Grant Agreements
SAS	Social Analysis Systems, Carleton University
SID	Special Initiatives Division
Team	External Review Team
UQAM	University of Quebec in Montreal

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ACRONYMS	v
PART ONE: INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW	1
<i>Background.....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Canadian Partnerships Program Aims and Objectives</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>External Review Scope and Objectives</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>External Review Team</i>	<i>2</i>
PART TWO: METHODOLOGY.....	3
<i>Review Design, Methods and Process</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Strengths/Limitations</i>	<i>4</i>
PART THREE: FINDINGS.....	5
<i>SECTION I – ACHIEVEMENT OF CP OBJECTIVES.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>SECTION II – A LOOK AT THE PROGRAM.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>SECTION III – OUTCOMES</i>	<i>17</i>
PART FOUR: CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS.....	22

Annexes

ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEX B: ON-LINE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

ANNEX C: LIST OF PROJECTS SAMPLED

ANNEX D: ON-LINE SURVEY RESULTS SUMMARIES

ANNEX E: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

ANNEX F: DATA ANALYSIS OF GRANT RECIPIENTS

ANNEX G: PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN – GRANT RECIPIENTS

ANNEX H: LIST OF COMMON QUESTIONS

ANNEX I: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

ANNEX J: OUTCOMES-INDICATORS FRAMEWORK

PART ONE: INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES OF THE REVIEW

“The Canadian Partnerships Program seeks to ensure IDRC’s active presence in the Canadian development research community. In keeping with the Centre’s mandate of empowerment through knowledge, it supports the contribution of research and knowledge to Canada’s involvement in the global search for ways to build healthier, more equitable, and more prosperous societies.”¹

Background

The International Development Research Centre (IDRC) was established by an Act of Parliament in 1970. The Act defines the Centre’s mandate and purpose as one that is focused on initiating and supporting research into the problems of developing regions of the world.² IDRC is a Crown Corporation reporting to Parliament through the Minister of Foreign Affairs. It receives most of its funds from a Parliamentary grant from within the International Assistance Envelope. It also generates additional funds from institutions such as the Microsoft Corporation, the Swiss and UK governments and the Hewlett, Gates and Ford Foundations among others.

IDRC’s Corporate Strategy and Program Framework is the Centre’s strategic plan, renewable every five years. This plan lays out the foundations for the Centre’s work: (its legislative mandate and purpose), its values and fundamental beliefs, its guiding principles, and its strategic objectives. It will, it states: *“enlist the talents of natural and social scientists in Canada and will seek to improve the opportunities for Southern researchers to access the knowledge and perspectives of Canadian researchers.”³*

The Canadian Partnerships Program (CP) was initiated in 1992. It is part of IDRC’s Special Initiatives Division (SID) and is one of the four modalities of the Centre’s programming with Canadian institutions. It is unique in that it is directly responsive to proposals from Canadian researchers and actors in civil society.⁴

The Program was put in place at a time when the Centre was questioning its privileged position as something ‘apart’ from other organisations within the country. It needed to rethink its relationship with Canada and Canadians. Guided by the Centre’s *raison d’être* to support research in international development, CP sought out broader institutional alliances with Canadian organizations beyond those already collaborating through the research programs. To make this type of alliance possible, IDRC widened the interpretation of research in development to include a spectrum of approaches allowing the involvement of a wide range of Canadians in international development.⁵ In short, it wanted to become better known within the Canadian research and development community through actively working together on projects, rather than relying on public relations.

CP started with one Program Officer and a budget of approximately 1 million dollars. It drew from a broad range of constituency groups in Canada engaged in knowledge-based activities offering links with international development. Today, it has gained a solid place amongst a variety of Canadian international development organisations, with a staff of five (plus an intern and summer student). CP now receives between 3% - 4% of the IDRC program allocation.⁶

Canadian Partnerships Program Aims and Objectives

The goal of the Canadian Partnerships Program is to assist with the creation and sharing of knowledge and practice that responds to the belief that Canada’s own security and prosperity is linked to the ideas, knowledge and innovations increasingly generated in a context of international development and international cooperation. Its objectives are broad: a) to build and maintain the Centre’s long-term

relationships with those key Canadian institutions that are most closely related to the Centre's overall mandate and mission through program support and collaboration; b) to strengthen the capacity and engagement of Canadian universities, research institutions and civil society organizations to address international development questions through research, knowledge sharing and networking; c) to facilitate and strengthen mutually beneficial Canada-Global South connections through collaborative research, knowledge sharing and networking; d) to increase the number of Canadians learning about and engaging with international development issues through their participation in knowledge production and sharing activities; and e) to explore and document innovative partnership mechanisms.⁷

External Review Scope and Objectives

In keeping with its focus as a learning organization, the Evaluation Unit (EU) of IDRC assists each program to evaluate its progress either through an internal, or external, process every five years. The EU states that the purpose of these reviews is to broaden the Centre's understanding of issues of importance to the staff, management and partners.⁸ This work contributes to the corporate knowledge about scope, characteristics and effectiveness of its support in order to inform the design and monitoring of future projects. The primary users of external reviews are Programs Management and the IDRC Board of Governors.⁹

Although the Canadian Partnerships Program has previously carried out an internal evaluation and some of the individual projects have been evaluated, this is the first external evaluation of the Program. This external review is in keeping with the Evaluation Unit's aim to assess the extent to which the Program is meeting its aims and objectives; identifying and managing its risks; as well as any evolution in its objectives. Its focus also extends to documenting the results of the Program and making recommendations on its support of research for development and issues for the CP Program. (Refer to Annex A, Terms of Reference)

External Review Team

The New Economy Development Group (NEDG) of Dal Brodhead and Wendy Quarry was contracted by IDRC to undertake the External Review with the expert support of Dr. Bill Found of Dalvorem International. It was ably assisted by NEDG researchers Jane McNamara and Guylaine Leclerc, as well as Sonja Vanek in the office.

PART TWO: METHODOLOGY

Review Design, Methods and Process

The design of the External Review consisted of a number of steps beginning with the construction of an overall picture of the program, its objectives and mode of operation. This step was followed by a closer scrutiny of the CP process including a document review; interviews with program and other IDRC staff, as well as interviewing contacts at all Core Partners. Additionally, through individual site visits and telephone interviews, a sample of other selected projects across the country was obtained. An on-line survey of all grant recipients during the Review period of 2005-2009 completed the data collection. (Refer to Annex B, On-line survey instruments). As this material was gathered, the Review Team revisited the overall methodology to further refine and develop the analytical framework, the survey and interview guidelines. This work was informed by on-going discussions with the CP Program and Evaluation Unit staff outlined in the Progress Report submitted at the end of June.

A project sampling approach was proposed in the Review Workplan along with accompanying rationale for project selection. This included geographic distribution related to volume of regional project activity, nature of project recipients (i.e. universities, NGOs, etc), size and duration of projects and frequency of funding, core and other project status, as well as by theme. A total of 74 projects were identified, spread throughout the provinces to roughly reflect the concentrations of initiatives in different parts of the country, although key informants were reached in only 57 projects. For the Review's purposes, the Team divided the CP grants into four basic categories: \$100,000 to \$500,000; \$40,000 to \$100,000; \$15,000 to \$40,000; and under \$15,000. It was also important to respond to a number of other approaches used by the CP Team to group projects. The partnership projects were also classified by themes such as Youth, Indigenous, Corporate/ Social Responsibility, Environment, Diaspora and Gender. Refer to Annex C (List of sample projects) for details.

Interviews were held across the country and included field visits to Victoria and Vancouver, Edmonton, Saskatoon and Winnipeg, as well as Halifax. Team members also undertook personal interviews in areas in close proximity to their home bases of Ottawa-Gatineau and Toronto, as well as telephone interviews in Montreal.

Given the large number of CP recipients during the Review period and their locations across the country, the team selected a sizeable sample of 74 projects to be interviewed (57 were reached) through varying levels of intensity. These projects are listed in the chart provided in Annex C. To obtain even greater input, an on-line survey (survey-monkey) was utilized to provide an opportunity to all 315 CP grant recipients supported during the Review period to provide their views. (Refer to Annex B for copy of the survey instrument). In order to obtain the maximum response, each person was sent an individually-addressed e-mail message in English or French, inviting him/her to complete the survey. Whenever possible, personal encouragement from the Team was provided. A table summarizing the on-line survey results can be found in Annex D. All in all, the invitation to complete the on-line survey was delivered successfully to 235 addresses (eighty of the original e-mail messages returned unanswered.). A total of 76 people completed the on-line questionnaire. This number of people is a large response – particularly taking into account the task of completing the survey, the length of time since some of the projects had been completed, and the fact that the request arrived during the summer-vacation period.¹⁰ A significant number of respondents – 55 took the trouble to add additional commentaries to the two questions that allowed for open-ended responses. The results of the survey have been integrated throughout the sections of this Review. It is also worth noting that grant recipients were universally willing to be interviewed and no outright refusals were encountered.

Strengths/Limitations

As with all assignments of this nature, there are specific challenges and certain weaknesses which emerge during the course of the exercise. The challenges are particularly evident in the case of a responsive program such as CP. This is a program that spans a wide range of projects with diverse objectives from research to activist in orientation, funded at very different levels of activity, across the breadth of Canada. The Review Team noted this uniqueness in its original Work Plan which stated that the CP Program is –

“both the same and different from other Programs within the Centre. It is the same in so far as its final objective is to support knowledge-oriented engagement of the Canadian community on international issues ... (however) its difference lies in its focus on developing and nurturing partnerships between IDRC and the Canadian research and development community.”¹¹

The Work Plan noted that the CP Program objectives are wide-ranging and all-encompassing thus posing particular challenges for the Review Team. Furthermore, the unclear link between the Program objectives and outcomes (and absence of indicators) has made it difficult to identify their relationship to results. Many of the past practices utilized to carry out the goals remain implicit, rather than explicit and are bound up in the exercise of long standing relationships within and external to the Program and IDRC.

A further key challenge was that the CP Program itself, as well as a majority of the long and short term projects and partnerships it supports, lack evaluations with the exception of the 6 (now 5) Core Partners. The CP team considers the Project Completion Reports as a form of internal evaluation, but the Review Team found them more technical than evaluative. The Review Team did obtain significant material about the project-level experience through its review of the available documentation, but most importantly through interviews with current and former key Program and project stakeholders. These in-person or phone discussions and interviews, supplemented by the on-line survey of all the projects, have focused on the utility and relevance of the project activities to the overall mandate of the Canadian Partnership Program and IDRC. In short, the challenge has been one of finding the correct and feasible balance between a focus on the Program and obtaining sufficient relevant Project-level information to support the overall Review findings.

The Team was, however acutely aware of its sample limitations. While its overall response rate to the interviews and survey has been higher than expected, it is clear that some contacts have been unavailable and others were hard to find. Given the five-year span of the Review period and the nature of the grants, many of them small, there have been some difficulties in finding knowledgeable project contacts due to staff turnover and changes in project situations. In addition, it was only possible to speak to a few respondents whose organizations had been refused grant applications. Thus, with few exceptions, the Team only met and interviewed people who were recipients of the CP grants and actively benefiting from the IDRC relationship. It wasn't possible to do a general survey to find out who else within the Research and Development community was either not benefiting or had not heard about the IDRC Canadian Partnership Program. The Team did not reach those who either did not know of the Program's existence or were turned down so early in the process their application was not on record. It was also somewhat affected by its need to work within a defined timetable which included the summer holiday period.

PART THREE: FINDINGS

SECTION I – ACHIEVEMENT OF CP OBJECTIVES

Global Overview – Progress in Reaching Its Aims and Objectives

The IDRC website states that the Canadian Partnerships Program seeks to ensure IDRC's active presence in the Canadian development research community. In keeping with the Centre's mandate of *empowerment through knowledge*, it supports the contribution of research and knowledge to Canada's involvement in the global search for ways to build healthier, more equitable, and more prosperous societies.

There is no doubt that in general the Canadian Partnerships Program is meeting this global objective. The External Review Team interviewed 72 individuals representing a wide range of programs and projects from universities and civil society organizations across the country, as well as IDRC current and former staff. Almost without exception interviewees commented on the importance of the Centre to the Canadian research and development community – 71% of respondents to the online survey indicated that CP had been “greatly” responsive to their requests.

There is ambivalence here. While the Canadian Partnership Program seeks to ensure IDRC's active presence in the Canadian development research community at the same time there is the perceived need to ‘stay below the radar’ for fear of being swamped with applications. The CP staff has not wanted to be in a position to say ‘no’ too often, nor has it wanted to jeopardize its labour intensive approach to assisting applicants in proposal development and subsequent support.

Interviewees commented on the willingness and ability of the CP staff to work closely with the applicants, taking a collegial approach to nurturing project proposals. Numerous respondents freely commented on the ability of CP staff to act like a ‘real’ partner as opposed to most traditional funders/donors. Comments such as: willingness to tackle difficult issues; understand the Canadian research and development scene and ability to provide sound advice – characterized the response to questions about the CP presence. Both the CP staff and the recipients commented on the Centre's aim to both be seen and behave differently from other Canadian grant making institutions.

The on-line survey noted that 62.9% of the respondents felt that the CP Program had been “greatly” flexible in negotiations and another 25.8% indicated “moderately” so. They also indicated that their projects have received substantive support and advice (in addition to financing) from the CP Team – some 58% felt this was the case either “greatly” or “moderately”. A total of 63.9% felt that the CP Program Team has “greatly” or “moderately” helped shape the recipient projects. (Refer to Annex D, On-Line Survey Results Summaries).

The Nature of the Objectives

The External Review Team was asked to assess the extent to which the Program is meeting its objectives, assess how risks to the achievement of the objectives were identified and managed and identify any evolution in the objectives (Review period 2005–2010).

The five Canadian Partnership objectives listed in its Strategy document for 2005-2010 are to:

1. build and maintain the Centre's long-term relationship with key Canadian institutions;
2. strengthen the capacity and engagement of Canadian universities, research institutions and civil society organizations to address international development questions through research, knowledge sharing and networking;

3. facilitate and strengthen mutually beneficial Canada-Global South connections through collaborative research, knowledge sharing and networking;
4. increase the number of Canadians learning about and engaging with international development issues through their participation in knowledge production and sharing activities;
5. contribute to realizing the centre's strategic vision with respect to Canadian institutions by exploring and documenting innovative partner mechanisms.

The Review Team found the CP objectives difficult to interpret and clearly delineate one from the other. In addition, the Team found the objectives hard to follow in the absence of indicators to guide it towards what the Program hoped to achieve (outcomes).

A close reading of each objective gives rise to more questions than answers. For example, the first objective begs the question: what constitutes a key partner and what does the Centre hope to achieve through this relationship? The second and fourth objectives are closely related to the first and give rise to the same questions. The third and fifth objectives contribute another angle to the Program – the desire to strengthen Canada – South linkages through research and to explore and document innovative partner mechanisms. There are no specifics as to what kind of research is desirable (or who it is that selects the research agenda), nor is there a stated strategy to actually document the innovative partner mechanisms.

While all of these comments may seem like ‘splitting hairs’ in the face of the overall evidence of success, the Team felt that there is a need for greater clarity in terms of the CP objectives and strategies.

Risk Management

The CP team acknowledges two levels of risk. The first is corporate and revolves around the fine line that the corporation needs to tread between providing sound and useful research with an aim to influencing policy making and what might be termed ‘advocacy’. Although there were anecdotes of a few instances when CP partners blurred the line between research and advocacy,¹² evidence gathered by the Review Team in interviews suggests that the CP team was careful to advise the partners of the need to focus on their research role. In interviews, members of the CP team reported that they also took extra steps internally to manage the risk by careful review of complicated projects through the involvement of additional levels of management and review by peers in other parts of the Centre. In addition, the use of small grants allows CP “to test the waters” as a risk management approach.

The second is the perceived risk of promoting the Program to a wider audience and then being unable to manage the flow of requests. In other words, how to gauge the tipping point between too much promotion and too little? The second risk is harder to assess. CP's strongly held belief that widespread promotion would result in an avalanche of applications (and the inability of the staff to manage the process) has not been tested. Indeed the reaction to this anticipated risk may have given rise to a greater risk of a perceived lack of transparency. This, in spite of the fact CP can be found on the IDRC website (indeed one respondent spoke of his accessing the web to cold call the Centre). A number of other respondents commented on the difficulty in finding the link on the IDRC site.

An important aspect of the CP Program is its willingness to respond to Canadian ID organizations and universities seeking to explore innovative and potentially politically sensitive initiatives with developing country partners. Examples would include CUSO's work in Latin America and PAC's work with the diamond mining issue. At the university level, another illustrative example can be found in the role IDRC played in ensuring the smooth transfer of the Miniatlas Human Security project from the University of British Columbia to Simon Fraser University. The challenge in such cases is to carefully manage the risks which can accompany innovation without stifling the initiatives. CP has not shied away from taking on risk and its partners appreciate its flexibility in this regard.

Niche

The CP program is at the very centre of IDRC's relationships with Canadian partners. As such, it 'grounds' the Centre within Canada. While it is not the only place where IDRC connects with other institutions in the country,¹³ as IDRC's responsive mechanism, it is frequently where Canadian institutions interested in working with and through the Centre are referred. Over the years, the CP team has interacted and learned a great deal about the Canadian research and development community; it is a repository of knowledge about who is doing what and where. CP's innate sense of the importance of networks has helped them use this knowledge wisely. It has made concerted efforts to link groups who share common interests with each other (refer to Section III, Outcome 3). The Program has also been a calculated risk taker and has understood the possibilities of supporting an initiative that might on the surface have appeared to be unsupportable. An example would be past CP encouragement for universities and NGOs (in the cases of SAS and GPI) to work together to form networks governed by similar procedures where both groups saw considerable risk in this idea.

SECTION II – A LOOK AT THE PROGRAM

A) PROGRAM

The desire to create an IDRC Program that would engage the Canadian research and development community grew out of the perceived need to have a political support base in Canada. IDRC was already working with some Canadian institutions (principally Canadian universities), but felt the need to strengthen the Canadian ties within the broader Canadian development community. It needed to build a *constituency*. The difficulty lay in deciding who to include within this community and how to engage them while remaining within the IDRC research mandate.

*“The IDRC Act states that: **Research** includes any scientific or technical inquiry or experimentation that is instituted or carried out to discover new knowledge or new means of applying existing knowledge to the solution of economic and social problems.”*

Research

The Canadian Partnership Program owes its niche within the Corporation and its innovative style in implementing the broad interpretation that the Centre takes to the meaning of the word 'research.' In 1992, much of the IDRC supported research focused on technical/scientific issues (food grain storage systems; seed banks etc.) and, to a lesser extent, on social sciences research. Today, IDRC accepts a wider interpretation – one that not only encompasses participatory research¹⁴ and action research,¹⁵ but also recognizes a broad spectrum encompassed within the concept of knowledge generation. What was significant is that this definition goes beyond the purely technical to everything that is involved in helping to bring new technologies and other innovations to people across the world. It meant that IDRC became involved in both the natural and social sciences. This broader approach to research opened the field to partnership with the NGO community in Canada. The Canadian Partnership Program has made very strategic use of this broad understanding of research and knowledge generation.

In the 1990s, Canadian NGOs were already experimenting with southern partners interested in this research approach – those that were not, were encouraged to do so by the CP staff eager to forge new relationships with a wider range of Canadian partners. Thus, the actual outcome of the CP partners' research was not the only focus, it extended to knowledge-sharing and research dissemination as well. CP was interested in initiating, nurturing and sustaining these partnerships and to support this role it encouraged linkages and networking through exchanges, assisting researchers to attend conferences and

workshops, as well as to support internships. This focus is clearly recognizable in CP's Strategy document for 2005-2010.

It is worth noting that participatory research or participatory action research (PAR) seeks to involve all relevant parties in examining together current action (which is experienced as problematic) in order to change and improve it. CP does support participatory research. It does not fund advocacy. Some NGOs engaged in both activities, when interviewed by the reviewers made a point of stressing their understanding of the distinction that CP adopted between research and advocacy. It was recognized that CP staff needed some agility to deal with the diversity of civil society organizations which undertook both research and advocacy/action.

Partnership – Nature of the Relationship

Nurturing the partnership has been and is a hallmark of the CP approach – the relationship has been a key focus. Most respondents interviewed commented on the nature of this relationship. It was constant, it was personal, it had continuity, it was extremely supportive and over time it grew to be based on trust.

“IDRC has provided critical early stage support for our work, without which we would not have been able to progress toward further project development. They have filled this critical need that has enabled essential partnership development, more detailed project design and project fundraising. The two project officers with whom I've worked directly have also been incredibly encouraging on a personal level. I have sensed a genuine concern from each about my personal well-being.” (Survey written commentary)

The 2005-2010 period under review illustrates that CP was proactive. The guidelines for CP staff have included stressing the need to seek organizations that saw research as a means towards an end – a search for a fairer, equitable, youth and gender balanced approach to development. The on-line survey responses demonstrate that several projects revolved around support for human rights, sustainable development and gender equity although there is no evidence that any explicit strategies existed to promote these issues.

“It was evident they knew what they wanted but at the same time were not risk adverse and not afraid of experimental ideas. One time I remember, they brought a disparate group of people together around a question and let these people develop their own agenda. This was a brilliant idea and we still have people talking about it” (Interview notes)

NGO partners expressed their appreciation for such an open-ended and innovative approach. They felt that supporting this open-ended approach to research was different from the mainstream IDRC Program methodology. A number mentioned their involvement in other IDRC Program Initiatives, some which happened as a result of earlier CP grants. They appreciated that CP staff took the time to coach and mentor them in improving their approach to research. They valued the support and capacity building. A number of university and civil society interviewees commented on the respectful partnership approach exemplified by CP.

There were also a few instances of organizations which did not feel well served and supported, especially when being considered for continued support after an initial grant. The Review Team did not identify any explicit criteria for continued support and a number of interviewees substantiated this lack of clarity. The strength of the personal relationships inevitably appeared to carry a certain amount of weight within the process most probably in the determination of funding levels, as well as the duration of the support. Given the absence of an open call for applications, initial introductions to CP are often due to meetings with staff at conferences and workshops, references from other grant recipients or in some cases through the proactive outreach of CP staff. While the majority of recipients reported being

supported and nurtured, the Team did learn of a few which did not experience the same positive relationship.

Geography was reported by a number of those interviewed to have played a role in helping partners have a better understanding of CP aims and objectives and vice versa as proximity to the head office naturally made the personal connections easier to sustain. It is clear from Table 1 that there has been a concentration of project investments in central Canada, not surprisingly given the distribution of the population and the concentration of NGOs and universities involved in international development activities. It is nevertheless not a sufficient reason to leave five provinces out of the picture almost entirely, with less than 8% of the total number of projects allocated to them between 2005-2009.

Table 1: Provincial Breakdown of Total Projects

Province	Projects	% of Total	Value	% of Total
Alberta	14	3.48	\$188,518	1.33
B.C.	40	9.95	1,232,925	8.73
Manitoba	12	2.99	128,050	0.91
New Brunswick	2	0.49	70,000	0.50
Newfoundland	1	0.25	32,340	0.23
Nova Scotia	19	4.72	877,831	6.21
Ontario	202	50.25	8,845,105	62.60
Quebec	103	25.62	1,945,319	13.76
Saskatchewan	3	0.75	215,440	1.52
Other	6	1.49	593,443	4.21
Total	402	100.00	\$14,128,971	100.00

Source: Provincial Breakdown of CP Grant Recipients, 2005-2009, IDRC, 2009-04-08.

Partnerships – Nature of the Practice

When CP was initiated in 1992, it inherited some of the partnerships already established between IDRC and other Canadian organizations. Some of these arrangements had been made through other Program Initiatives (PIs)¹⁶ while others were the result of corporate strategies. The International Institute of Sustainable Development (IISD), for example grew out of the Rio Conference and Canada's subsequent leading role in Agenda 21. Support for this leadership role was assumed by IDRC which for the past seventeen years has provided IISD with an office within the IDRC premises (although this office arrangement is about to change), as well as an annual allocation.

Core Partners¹⁷

There were initially six Core partners during the period of the Review. Interviews with CP management suggested that Core Partners tend to be apex organizations (AUCC; CASID; CCIC) representing constituencies across the country, however North South Institute (NSI) and IISD fall outside this category. These two organizations are referred to by IDRC as 'Institutional Partners' although this status was not clear to some of the people and institutions interviewed.

What then distinguishes Core Partners from the others? They receive multi-year funding which includes support of staff salaries, and some overhead costs. CP staff meets with them on a more regular basis and attend some of their workshops and Board meetings. Table 2 below illustrates both the number and size of the grants to the Core Partners. Given the level of commitment by CP, they are expected to report at least annually to IDRC and a collegial relationship is expected. All Core partners have been evaluated (some

by IDRC and others through CIDA or self evaluation). IDRC has recently taken the decision to drop one core partner, due to an absence of capacity and performance, as evidenced in an externally commissioned evaluation.

This practice does raise the question as to what makes one organization eligible to be a Core Partner while another is not and the reviewers found some ambiguity in that regard. Other organizations have been considered for or been interested in a similar status (such as CIGI and the Canadian Coalition for Global Health),¹⁸ but no changes in the Core partner group have taken place recently. At the time of writing, the Review Team was informed that IDRC CP was considering adding a few new institutional partners which could include multi-sectoral institutions.

Table 2: Breakdown of Organization Type in CP Review

Type	# Organizations (%)	# Projects (%)	\$ Value (%)
Core Partner*	4 (2.15)	9 (2.24)	\$2,209,635 (15.64)
Educational Institution	39 (20.97)	155 (38.56)	5,025,088 (35.56)
NGO	130 (69.89)	222 (55.22)	6,196,455 (43.86)
Other**	13 (6.99)	16 (3.98)	697,793 (4.94)
Total	186 (100)	402 (100)	\$14,128,971 (100)

* The Core Partner list and columns in this table do not include the two institutional partners – IISD & NSI due to the limitations of the data source noted below.

** Other: Groups include government departments, one consortium, individual consultancies, and stand alone conferences.

Source: Provincial Breakdown of CP Grant Recipients, IDRC, 2009-04-08.

Small Grants

The small grants are the absolute core of the CP program as can be seen in Table 2. An example would be both the number of projects funded by CP through NGOs and universities. Small grants have been the entry point, the mechanism through which new organizations have gained access to the IDRC network. They have also been the indispensable tool through which CP has tested potential relationships and an important aspect of CP's approach to risk mitigation. Small grants have been used to fund innovative ideas and small grants have supported networking (i.e. sending people to conferences to present research, etc), speakers, and development of new research ideas.¹⁹ Small grants have come at a high administrative cost, but CP has evolved methods to make this load more manageable (i.e. first refusal comes from the research officer level; small grants do not require a technical report, etc.). Small grants have been a platform for leveraging other grants – some continuing, but small and some larger. While many small grants offered valuable opportunities for larger projects to grow, this approach enabled CP to take some chances, to test the exposure to risk which comes with opportunities to innovate and to build on demonstrated positive experience utilizing small amounts of money at the outset.

Larger Grants

The CP team often uses small grants to test out a partnership. If the partner organization shows that it can produce quality results and/or if it has leveraged funding from other sources, CP recipients have grown a small grant into a much larger grant and into a continuing relationship over many years. Inter Pares, for example began its IDRC relationship with a grant of \$5,000 and over time has moved from there to be a current recipient of a \$120,000 grant to study the significance of feminist analysis on north south relationships. Similarly, Kairos began with small grants to produce brief policy documents and gradually worked up to now doing deeper studies on issues of principal importance to IDRC such as climate change.

Networking

CP staff actively look for NGOs that are already working together. Most importantly they look for NGOs that might be working with universities. Canadian Partnership believes in the value of networks and they show this belief through their efforts to bring disparate groups together (e.g. the initial effort to bring four Area Learned Societies together to share one \$100,000 grant). Partner after partner commented on the CP efforts to put one group in touch with another – on their strong commitment to networking. Seventy-five percent of respondents to the on-line survey indicated that they had been introduced to new networks of researchers through their work on CP projects, and many indicated their indebtedness to IDRC staff members for introducing them to new contacts.

“When the CP Team noted that two separate proposals (one from Partnership Africa Canada, PAC, the other from the University of Quebec in Montreal, (UQAM) both intended to focus on aspects of the African Peer Review mechanism, CP thought that it would make sense to put the two groups (who had some former knowledge of the other) in touch with each other. The result was that UQAM invited the PAC contact who was the Chair of the National Governing Council (APRM) in Ghana to attend a Roundtable at UQAM. Later, PAC agreed to fund a three day Workshop in Freetown on the African Peer Review Mechanism and was able to use IDRC money to send the same person to Freetown to assist in the process.”

Agenda Setting – Who Sets the Agenda – North or South

In the nearly two decades since IDRC initiated the CP Program, development thinking has moved from its initial North to South paternalistic approach to a greater acceptance of the obvious point that development is in the eyes of the beholder. It recognizes the fact that the North does not necessarily have all of the answers. This realization has had a direct impact on the development of constructive research agendas. The question now asked is: research for whom and who sets the agenda? The IDRC Corporate Strategy and Program Framework, 2005-2010²⁰ states that its approach to Canadian partnerships will be driven by the research agenda of its southern partners, while CP’s Strategy (2005-2010) indicates that it will be responsive to Canadian partners’ proposals. It goes on to specify ‘in most cases IDRC support will emphasize working with southern colleagues, rather than doing research on, or even on behalf of, the south.’²¹ While the Review Team did find evidence of some new North-South partnerships, it did not find evidence that involving southern partners was always the case. However, interviews indicated that CP staff did make consistent efforts to encourage Canadian partners to include Southern partners in the conceptualization of projects.

In the interviews, CP referred to itself as a ‘helpful listener’ between NGOs and Universities and their relationship between and amongst each other and their partners in the south. In responding to the on-line survey, 50% of the recipients who responded indicated that the CP Program had “greatly” supported effective partnerships between Canadians and researchers in the Global South through the projects funded and another 21.1% replied that CP had “moderately” supported them (the second highest of 5 categories). In interviews, CP partners noted that ‘good partnerships’ are often based on ‘shared values’, but must be problem focused; In the absence of ‘mutual concern on practical problems, partnerships risk becoming paper-base exercises.

B) THE PROCESS

The Projects

The projects that CP funded tell the story of CP past and present. They are the vehicles through which CP expresses its mandate and its unique relationship with its partners and the international development constituency in Canada. As noted elsewhere in this paper, they are not just funded to do good research. Their purpose is two fold – to generate and apply knowledge and to grow and support the Canadian

International Development (ID) constituency. CP is specifically IDRC's outreach to Canadian institutions and individuals – it is its responsive mechanism.

Selection and Recruitment

In the absence of clear indicators for the CP objectives, the issue of project selection is particularly difficult to understand. A review of the available documentation did not entirely clarify the situation. The Project Approval Documents (PAD) linked the project goals to IDRC global objectives but did not identify specific CP selection criteria. While there are selection criteria for the small grants posted on the IDRC website, specific criteria for the larger grants are not evident. In fact, it appears that there may be selection criteria which have evolved over time as circumstances have required, but which remain in the main implicit rather than explicit. At the same time, the absence of open calls for applications has made the process one of continual intake limited in large measure by the availability of staff and financial resources at any one time.

Given its mandate to reach out to the Canadian ID constituency, it is important to recognize CP's role in recruiting new partners into the project development process. This recruiting role is linked to the selection process in what many partners have felt is a supportive and seamless process, unlike those of other funding organizations. CP is clearly interested in finding the best possible partners, those who are interested in real partnerships and not simply those with extensive resumes and established centres. Therefore, CP is prepared to spend the time assisting potential partners in their proposal development.

“The on-line survey showed that 68.4% of respondents rated administrative relations and communication with CP team to be excellent (with a further 23.7% giving a rating of good). Respondents felt strongly that CP had provided clear guidance and documentation concerning its expectations for the project.”

Mandate

So what, then, have been the criteria which have been applied to the incoming applications? What has caused them to be adapted? Also, what has governed the size, duration and nature of the grants awarded or those not approved? The overarching framework is clearly the IDRC Act which includes a definition of research stating that “research includes any scientific or technical inquiry or experimentation that is instituted or carried out to discover new knowledge or new means of applying existing knowledge to the solution of economic and social problems.” The interpretation of this mandate is thus not limited to the generation of knowledge, but in addition, it has an applied focus which speaks to the dissemination and networking activities often supported by CP.

Criteria

Within this broadly defined mandate, the interviews and document examinations have helped the Reviewers identify a number of implicit CP selection criteria. These criteria are applied at the discretion of the Program Officer with his/her understanding of the implicit boundaries which governed the use of CP grant monies. Their relative importance is not clear so the criteria noted below are not listed in an order of priority.

They are as follows:

- research related to areas of common interest to both northern and southern partners and is more applied than theoretical;
- work which tends to be oriented towards primarily benefitting the south;
- involvement which opens doors to or supports Canadian ID relationships;

- investments which promote linkages within and between sectors (i.e. the universities and NGO's, but to a far lesser degree the private sector);
- seed monies directed towards emerging ideas, innovative options, new constituencies - a sort of early warning/recognition system;
- commitments which may strengthen collaborative institutional arrangements
- resources aimed at extending the reach of ID ideas or institutions;
- leveraging of other resources into ID knowledge development and sharing;
- broadening the engagement of the Canadian public in ID and knowledge of the role and value of IDRC in this regard;
- providing access to IDRC resources by individuals and institutions/agencies from across the country, from a diversity of groups, ages, genders and cultures;
- research which complements IDRC thematic priorities;
- commitments which are responsive to demand from the Canadian ID constituency which meaningfully involve southern partners.

In addition to the criteria noted above, there are also issues of political sensitivity and risk management which influence project selection. The bottom line has been a CP definition of itself as relationship oriented. Staff stressed in interviews that the Program measures success in part as the development and nurturing of a series of 'good relationships' with a wide range of research and development organizations within Canada. It was frequently stressed by CP and other IDRC staff that the CP Program is a responsive granting initiative that must remain flexible and open to new ideas and trends.

Categories

There are some overarching categories into which the projects selected may fit, but these too lack clear parameters. So for instance, there are grants to Core Partners, Partner (Fraternal) Institutions, Long Term Partners, and short term recipients. There was reference to clusters of grants, but these seemed to be descriptors used after the fact for administrative tidiness. None of these categories were clearly defined, but they were referred to under various names by staff and recipients, as well as in internal documentation. Published criteria and categories were not in evidence and thus transparency is an issue; even recipients who were interviewed were confused in terms of where they fit and whether they could move from one status to another – say short term to longer term or longer term to core partner.

Rigour

It is important to underline the point that was made by a number of grant recipients (large and small) that the selection process is seen to be rigorous and time consuming. In many cases, the process has led to better project definition and expected results. For example, one partner respondent stressed that the iterative approach improved project design. In a similar vein, an interviewee said that *"at first we felt that they were creating obstacles, then we began to realize that CP really wanted to understand what it was we were doing and their questioning strengthened our proposal."* (Interview). This process appeared to form the basis of CP's unique nurturing approach which often led to improved project design, research depth and sharing of knowledge.

Virtually without exception, grant recipients mentioned CP's supportive approach even in circumstances when applications were turned down. A respectful, iterative discussion, lead by the CP Program officer was reported as characteristic. CP staff often went well beyond meeting the project administration requirements and extended into facilitating networking, linking common interests and deepening the knowledge base, as well as providing useful content input. The on-line survey summary results support this view. (Refer to Annex D). It is clear that the staff person is crucial to this discourse and its resolution falls to him/her, as does the interpretation of the range of selection criteria which is based upon a

checklist. Although the specific criteria being utilized in the selection process might have remained a mystery, the positive relationships which resulted were universally reported as being worth the effort.

However, the Review Team did encounter some projects that did not receive the same level of attention. There were two instances in which partners reported that they felt they had not received enough support to grow into a larger, more productive relationship with CP. In contrast to these instances, one university contact who did receive extra support on proposal preparation was offended that CP would have thought there was a need for additional advice in the preparation of their project proposal.

Scale and Duration

This Review only covers the five year period 2005-2010, however the funding of certain organizations dates back to the early years of CP. As noted earlier, there are several categories of projects, namely the core, institutional and longer term grant recipients for whom CP support has been ongoing or at least multi-year. The annual core and institutional partner grants tend to be in the \$100,000-500,000 range and include both program and administrative support. Their continuation is based upon a year-end financial and program report submitted to IDRC. This report is based upon a work plan and budget negotiated in a formal annual senior management level meeting and subsequent staff follow-up. There are also long term partners who have grown with CP based upon specific, but regular successful project outputs and subsequent submissions. Some of these grants become substantial in size, but ongoing funding is by no means assured.

There is a category of large grant recipients (\$100 K and over) such as GPI and SAS for example, who have had considerable support from the outset but for whom the support will not last beyond three to four years. The case of SAS funding channelled through Carleton University is a case in point. It received substantial multi-year funding which helped SAS leverage other resources and contracts. SAS/Carleton was not a core or institutional partner so why did it benefit disproportionately as compared to other projects or programs? The point is not intended to criticize support to SAS, but instead is to raise the issue as to the criteria for selecting one project partner rather than another for significant multi-year funding and the optics of this selection. What happens if an organization has successfully completed a project? Does success qualify them for additional funding if requested? The answer to this question is not clear.

There are other larger grant recipients who began their relationship with CP as a recipient of a small grant which was to test their capabilities. These grew into larger or repeated grants. Examples would be PAC, Inter Pares and the Mennonite Central Committee which are NGOs and the Universities of Calgary, Ottawa and UQAM. It is the entry into this group of partners which is the conundrum as it is not a competitive process. On the surface, it would appear to be the result of successful graduation from smaller to larger grants, but this is not always the case. Table 3 indicates that approximately 10% of projects continue beyond three years.

Table 3: Project Duration

Total Projects	Under 2 years	2 – 3 years	3 + years	Unknown*
402	288	8	43	63

* Unknown: projects that have started within the last year. Not enough information available to determine their term.

Sources: Contacts – sip – cp, IDRC, 2009-04-21; CP Grant Recipients, IDRC, 2009-04-05.

A number of organizations and individuals interviewed expressed a desire to graduate to more assured funding and even to a core funding contract annually. Yet, it is clear from discussions with CP staff that there is no graduation process.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The CP approach to monitoring evaluation varied depending on the size and nature of the grant. The core and institutional partners were expected to undertake periodic internal evaluations which were shared with IDRC, along with their annual reports. During the annual meetings with IDRC, the partners would brief IDRC senior managers and Program staff and would discuss the activities and outcomes. Each recipient of a large grant was expected to submit an annual work plan and to submit a year-end financial and activity report measured against the initial plan and budget. Smaller grantees were expected to submit a year-end report on their budget utilization for accountability purposes. IDRC makes the distinction between what they call, *Research Related Grant Agreements (RRGA)* and *Research Support Grant Agreements (RSGA)*. The first category tends to be small (usually below \$15,000 for conferences, travel etc.) and while the contracts in this category do stipulate a report there is no monetary hold back to ensure compliance with the request. The second category, however also demands a report. In addition there is a monetary holdback to ensure delivery. Surprisingly, reporting on projects is not primarily at the output level or outcome, but instead is focused on activities. In fact a number of grant recipients commented favourably on the absence of outcome oriented reporting requirements.

As noted elsewhere, the CP program officers cultivated a supportive collegial relationship which involves periodic informal communication and meetings at conferences and seminars throughout the year. These officers are plugged into the ID sector in Canada and have considerable knowledge of southern issues and players. The relationships which did develop were universally valued and in some senses constituted a mechanism for CP's on-going monitoring and evaluation of project performance.

In the absence of clearly defined CP Program outcome indicators, it has been difficult to report on the Program at that level, just as it has been a challenge to review or evaluate projects against the overall Program goals. The Team was able to review in-depth evaluations done for each of the "Core" partners which were comprehensive and informative, but the Team did not encounter substantive evaluations initiated by CP of other CP funded partners.

What is missing is the treasure trove of stories drawn from the projects which could have provided a qualitative measure of the value of the work which interview respondents stressed continually. The Review Team encountered story after story of interesting results and experiences. Examples would be PAC's experience with the Kimberley Process (diamonds) and its COPAGEN work (protecting genetic heritage). Other interesting stories could be told about St. Mary's work with the University of Zacatecas setting up joint graduate level studies programs and the Harmony Foundation's initiative training Chinese urban decision makers in sustainable community development. (Refer to Section III, Outcome four for examples).

Sustainability

Sustainability, a subject which was raised intermittently in the interviews seemed to mean different things to different people and organizations. Implicit in some of the documents and discussions was a wish that somehow ID institutions and or projects would become financially and programmatically sustainable (thus sustainability would be an indicator of success). What does this concept mean in the context of CP? In some interviews, grant recipients noted that CP was committing funds to help germinate an idea, but that its ongoing nourishment needed to be funded by someone else. In a few cases, grantees approached the private sector for support. A more promising and effective strategy was found to be one of leveraging

funds from other funders, including governments, but the Achilles heel here was that money for operations and administration was hardly ever available and in the rare cases where it was, often it was insufficient. Interestingly enough, CP did recognize this problem and in the case of its core partners and a few other grant recipients, it did and does provide operational as well as program dollars. In the absence of a clear sense of what sustainability may mean for CP, project recipients questioned it as an objective. The aim of one of the grantees, for instance, to provide open and free of cost access to its tools, standards materials and report templates in developing countries was difficult to rationalize if sustainability as a goal meant revenue generation within this project by charging for access.

Communication

In the context of CP, communication means a number of different things. It refers to both internal and external communication, dissemination of knowledge including stories, as well as information management. It also has an element of risk management. What emerges loud and clear from the numerous interviews with recipients and IDRC staff is that it has been the personal communication that has counted, that has been unique and that has brought credit to CP and IDRC by association. It is also evident that the CP Program has been and is an untold and largely unknown story – even many of the interviewees confessed to not really knowing very much about CP. Fortunately, it is also a mainly positive narrative and deserves to be known for the benefit of CP, IDRC and also the participants in the projects, as well as the Canadian public.

“An NGO supported example would be HURIDOCs, an MCC sponsored project. With five small grants of a maximum of \$19,900 in any one year, the project supported the development of a powerful human rights search engine with access to 4,500 human rights sites from 168 countries. It is accessible in five languages and has developed tools and reporting techniques which are used by its volunteer members based in many countries. It documents human rights violations through a continuous participatory process from a coordinating office with two staff based in Geneva. CP assisted the Canadian volunteer member of the Executive Committee to travel to Board meetings and briefings and this contribution was judged as important to the continuity of the work and the bare bones operations of the organization. Other support was obtained from MCC in Canada and approximately twelve other donors.”²²

CP is neither well communicated within IDRC, nor on the outside. CP has been slow in providing the information even though its stories abound. It has made several attempts such as its recent initiative to summarize its support to various themes (indigenous peoples; youth; social economy in development etc), but the intended audience for this material is unclear. In contrast, the article on the CP support for diaspora that appeared in AUCC’s regular publication international insert called Uniworld-UniMonde is clearly intended to raise awareness within the university community.²³

On a more practical note, while the reviewers were ably assisted by CP in accessing relevant files, the information management system is less than user-friendly. It does contain the essential documentation required for decision-making such as the initial correspondence, the proposal and budget, the project approval document (PAD), and usually the end-of year reports submitted by the grant recipient. The core and institutional partners also supply annual reports and more detailed financial records, but as noted above, there are many cases where reports are not a requirement. Given that most of the CP grants are small, the rationale presented is that it is unfair to demand volumes of documentation in return for limited dollars. In this respect, CP is a considerate donor. It would help however if CP encouraged or required its partners and other recipients to submit stories and notes written for their own self-evaluation use and then shared them with CP. One of the challenges associated with collecting such stories relates to IDRC’s project information management system, which currently is not well set-up to track and manage data on small grants. Indeed, locating documentation on the implementation of small grants was a challenge for the reviewers in the course of this evaluation.

SECTION III – OUTCOMES

The Canadian Partnership Strategy document (2005–2010) contains four expected program outcomes relating to their five objectives noted earlier. (Refer to Annex J). The overall assessment of the Program shows that it has been very successful in meeting these objectives. This success is based more upon its internal tacit knowledge, its iterative process around proposal preparation and its mostly excellent communication with Partners, than for its emphasis upon explicit outcomes. CP's good reputation, so well articulated in the survey and interviews, is not underpinned by commensurate documentation. It is a Program which to date, has focused more on the building of good relationships than on reaching specific program level outcomes.

The CP objectives are clearly stated at the beginning of its Strategy document, however, it presents the Outcomes several pages after the description of the Program objectives thus creating a sense of disconnect. There is no results framework and no set of indicators to frame the achievement of results. In addition, the Review Team noted that the CP staff did not make any reference to the expected outcomes when questioned during the interviews. Several CP grant recipients commented favourably on the fact that CP did not demand a description of intended project outcomes, although they have been requested by CP in the past two years for projects over a designated total.

For the purposes of this Review, the Team used IDRC's Outcome Mapping document (2001) to look at Outcomes as 'effects of the program "being there," with a focus on how actors behave as a result of being reached.' The Team noted that an outcome challenge describes how the behaviour, relationships, activities, or actions of an individual, group or institutions will change if a program is extremely successful. Therefore in the absence of indicators, the Review Team has worked through a logic model that moves from objectives to activities and outputs managed by the Program as services to the beneficiaries intended to lead towards specified Outcomes. From this point, the Review Team developed indicators (or progress markers) that it would expect to see resulting from the Program's services. (Refer to Annex J). In order to tabulate these findings, a code number was assigned to each Partner interview. The content of each interview was scanned to pick out examples that related to each of the indicators. Each indicator was rated²⁴ and is summarized in a chart below in the Outcomes Section.

A detailed analysis of our findings has allowed the Review Team to note a high degree of achievement within each program level outcome articulated in the CP Strategy document. (Refer to Annex J, Outcomes-Indicators Framework). Overall the Review Team findings demonstrate that CP has made significant progress in achieving all of its intended Outcomes.

Outcome 1: Key Canadian institutions most closely related to the Centre's mandate and mission will have strengthened their capacity, as convenors, coordinators and users of multi-institutional initiatives to generate, share or use knowledge on international development issues.

Key Canadian institutions deemed to be closest to the Centre's mandate and mission are what CP calls, Core or Institutional Partners. There are five Core/Institutional partners at present.²⁵ Some CP interviewees expressed a desire to join that category. All six current (and past) Core partners commented on the effective communication they have enjoyed with CP. Respondents to the interviews indicated a "high" level of communication as noted below. They felt that the funding process has effectively created an unusually high degree of security and trust and this view was supported by the interview findings. All five partners have used IDRC support to convene meetings; hold seminars; conferences and take on initiatives to both generate and share knowledge. Some have acknowledged that key aspects of their work have been enabled through CP support. Two partners point to outstanding differences due to their relationship with CP. AUCC, seen as IDRC's gateway to Canadian universities, admits that it would be

highly significant if it were to lose IDRC support²⁶ since it allows AUCC to ‘shine a spotlight on North-South issues that it couldn’t do otherwise.’ As a result, AUCC claims to have leveraged the learning gained from their partnership to affect thinking in CIDA and Federal funding for research. The support has also kept Canadian universities engagement with international development issues and southern partners firmly on the map. Many universities now make “internationalization” a key component of their strategic plans, and several, such as York and Saskatchewan have opened special offices to assist students and faculty members in their international endeavours. Similarly, CCIC acknowledges that CP support has allowed it to convene geographic working groups opening the way for deeper involvement with their southern partners including a southern partner led research agenda. The Program helps them remain topical when needed (as other funds are often tied down to specific activities) and paves the way for CCIC to work on policy strategically and methodically using NGO field work to bring evidence forward.

To a lesser extent, IISD and the North South Institute (NSI) have used CP funds to convene meetings, support research, visiting scholars etc. and they are planning to embark on developing a shared Strategic Plan to increase synergies between the organizations. Several partners commented favourably on CP’s interest in seeing stronger organizational strategic plans developed and their willingness to contribute to the process, as well as their openness in requesting advice from the partners on project proposals.

The box below is a compilation of the data coming from the interviews with the 6 Core Partners

Indicator	Data
1. Evidence of on-going communication between CP and Partners strengthens partnership	High
2. Funding mechanisms in place over a defined period leads to trust	High
3. Linkages between Canadian institutions and relevant Canadian and international networks are established	Medium
4. Ongoing exchange of ideas, feedback and advice between institutions	Medium
5. Exchange of ideas regarding emerging trends	Medium
6. Cooperation in pursuit of common goals and strategic plans	Low

Outcome 2: Canadian universities, research institutions and civil society organizations will have integrated or mainstreamed in various degrees, attention to international development questions in their research, information sharing or utilization activities.

CP’s mandate to strengthen the capacity and engagement of Canadian universities and civil society organizations to address international development through research, knowledge sharing and networking has resulted in considerable change amongst CP partners. Responses from five interviewees indicated that they feel CP helped them open the door to a more international approach while others who claim they have always had a focus on international development recognized that CP support helped them deepen this approach. Several NGOs, including Inter Pares, Kairos, CCEDNet and Mining Watch have pointed out that CP has helped them improve their research capabilities in the area of international development leading to input into policy development. Other CP recipients have been assisted in altering a purely academic research approach into a more inclusive approach involving other partners. In a number of cases, CP has suggested that organizations bring in partners from the South to participate in research planning. CP funds have also supported university-based international development research studies (IDS) such as the IDS program at St. Mary’s which hosted a speakers program with CP support over a number of years. In addition, CP has nurtured information sharing between various Canadian universities and universities in the south (refer to Outcome 3). Although not outcomes per se, publication and dissemination of conference and action research materials and findings on international development, as well as mounting of relevant web sites was stressed by many interviewees as important products which happened as a result of CP support.

While most Partners acknowledged appreciation of CP monetary support, several expressed a wish to obtain a more stable, multi-year funding approach. Some of the interviewees were unclear as to why their funding ended, while others felt that CP's iterative process helped them understand what would or would not be supported. When interviewed, a few grant recipients located in one or two organizations in more outlying areas were not satisfied with this process. The majority of recipients interviewed felt the monetary support was appropriate. The synthesis of interview findings noted below signals a medium level of satisfaction in this regard. They commended CP on the manner in which proposal development was handled, the satisfactory and diligent process of obtaining funds. They also acknowledged the significant impact that CP support had on their programming. CP as a rule encouraged grant recipients to obtain other funding, but the Team identified at least five projects which are totally dependent on CP funding (CEBEM, Drishti, the Mexico-Canada program in Engineering at the University of Western Ontario and GPI in Halifax).

Almost all interviewees commented on the excellent support provided by CP to access networks and researchers, their guidance in research, information sharing and utilization services. As an example, CP assisted the Carleton University SAS program, helping them develop a network of trainers in Canada, Asia and Latin America. CP further supported SAS in bringing these networks together in an exchange of ideas and experience at a conference in Ottawa in 2008. Through the CP support and networking, SAS is being applied by the government of Bolivia. SAS also works with Hydro Quebec in Canada.

The box below is a compilation of the most pertinent findings from the interviews with grant recipients.

Indicator	Data
1. Active outreach to Canadian institutions to provide added focus and depth to ID research, information sharing or utilization	High
2. Indications of appropriate monetary and other support	Medium
3. Access to networks and researchers facilitated	High
4. Guidance towards high quality research in international development, as well as information sharing & utilization activities	High
5. Training and educational programs provided to address international development questions	Medium
6. Organizations formally identify international development as a priority interest	High

Outcome 3: Canadian and Southern partner institutions and organizations will have benefited in several ways from connections facilitated or supported between them.

A central feature of the CP Program has been to link Canadians with Southern partners through institutional connections which are facilitated and supported by the Program. The on-line survey results underlined the importance of this priority by showing that 75% of the respondents had been introduced to new networks of researchers through participation in CP supported initiatives. Most NGOs and universities have stressed the importance of these linkages. A case in point is the North South Knowledge Partnership involving the Centre for Intercultural Communications at UBC and the Bolivian Centre for Multidisciplinary Studies (CEBEM). Its arrangement resulted in half of the funding going to five organizations in Canada and half to the Southern partner CEBEM.

The ongoing challenge of identifying potential Southern partners has amplified the important role CP has played in connecting potential partners. Examples include the CUSO project which set aside the time needed to make effective contact with suitable partners. Connecting partners was a big part of the University of Western Project with Mexico and the University of Saskatchewan placement of research

interns, as well as the work done by St. Mary's University with the Mexican University of Zacatecas. The Global South component has become more prominent within the university and NGO communities as a result of CP support. This north-south contact is exemplified by the University of Ottawa Project linking Canadian low-income youth with youth in Nicaragua and El Salvador. CP encouraged a joint-planning mechanism between all partners resulting in southern input to project design. The Alternative Net Project in Quebec led to the creation of a nine member international organization, seven of whose members are from the South. CCIC noted the extremely valuable investment it had made in its regional working groups in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Concordia University initiative stressed the importance of the social economy and Alternatives Net actively supported the concept of Social Forums on global issues – now a network of Forums. Mining Watch also had a singular focus on holding mining companies accountable and this common challenge helped them bring together mining communities in the North and the South.

The opportunity for Canadians to learn from NGO work was considerable. GPI and the Harmony Foundation reported increased interest on the part of Canadian institutions both in BC and Nova Scotia in reassessing their well-being analysis. CCIC and Inter Pares reported that they were able to deepen their international work without losing their sense of ownership over their priorities. The role of CP was reported by many respondents to have been vital in enabling them to undertake outreach to the South and to build their networks. Several projects reported their work resulted in the emergence of multi-faceted networks which went beyond North-South relationships into South-South and South-North arrangements. These CP recipients included Inter Pares, the UQAM Mining Project and the Concordia social economy work.

The box below is a compilation of the data from the interviews of grant recipients.

Indicator	Data
1. Connections between partners (north and south) facilitated by CP are acknowledged. Concrete benefits described	High – number who acknowledged North South connections Medium to High – concrete results described
2. New relationships have been forged through CP support	High
3. Training delivered, research findings and publications produced and disseminated	High
4. Demonstrated benefits from exchanges and networking between North and South	High
5. Appropriate partners are identified and recruited, and their partnerships maintained to carry out shared goals	Medium

Outcome 4: The Centre's strategic vision with respect to Canadian institutions will have found new ways of expressing itself through innovative partner mechanisms.

In essence, the entire CP program addresses the IDRC's third strategic objective which outlines the Centre's aim to leverage additional Canadian resources for research for development by facilitating (funding) partnerships between Canadian institutions and institutions in the developing world. CP embodies the IDRC's search for creative relationships. The notion of innovation in partnership arrangements can take a variety of forms and this certainly happened within CP supported projects. There are multiple examples. The research undertaken in Bhutan on the Genuine Progress Index, as part of the GPI Atlantic Project has influenced the discussion of the Nova Scotia Government's measurement of well-being. The Fogquest Project, a volunteer run effort, connected Canadian and Chilean interns and continued to widen the application of technology for capturing water. It is an example of practical innovation and partnership. Inter Pares work with Dalhousie University and the University of Alberta, Sustainable Production Project which brought together community, university, as well as Southern and

Northern NGOs to establish NGO-driven multi-sector partnerships is another case in point. This activity connected the university and NGO communities to southern action research efforts around the productive use of marginal farm land and was innovative partnering at its best. Joint efforts of this type which have not been common in the past continue to remain a challenge. It is clear that CP values this aspect of development and has supported it.

Other partnerships such as those forged through LACREG, illustrate the potential for partnerships with and between Southern universities. The NGO – University linkage at UQAM concerned with the issue of mining enabled the development of a focused cross-sector partnership mechanism. This Project developed a unique knowledge-sharing approach by promoting the transfer of expertise from one Southern region to another – thus building on the capacity present in the South. Here expertise developed in Africa is now being shared with young researchers in Latin America. Other projects reported innovations including the CUSO Project which resulted in knowledge-sharing through the development of a collaborative approach to learning entitled “Co-creation of Knowledge” putting new technologies to use by communities. The McGill University Project researched the lives of unaccompanied minors in Canada, to explore their experiences, how they cope, their migration patterns and policy applications to their situations. Some of the researchers were from the South (Sudan). The Southern partners were in fact the youth involved in the research. This innovative partnership approach led to the involvement of youth as project leaders – it was youth-led and involved links with their country of origin.

Another unique partnership mechanism was established by the Harmony Foundation working with the mayors of Chinese cities to develop good environmental planning. This approach resulted in a partnership linking Canadian regions and Chinese regions sharing similar circumstances. The Canadian Coalition for Global Health Research placed emphasis upon the importance of South-South partnership mechanisms and the need to validate their role by more direct funding agency relationships. The concept of collaborative networks espoused by St. Mary’s University in Latin America, Africa and Asia with Dalhousie University, UQAM and York University demonstrated other interesting emerging partnership arrangements.

The box below is a compilation of the data from the interviews of grant recipients.

Indicator	Data
1. Evidence of risk taking around unusual or new initiatives partnership initiatives	Low
2. Presence of genuinely innovative partnerships	Medium
3. Demonstrated risk management	Medium
4. Stories documenting innovative partnerships produced and disseminated	Low

PART FOUR: CONCLUSIONS and RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation # 1 – Invest in the Future of the Canadian Partnership Approach

It is recommended that IDRC continue to invest in the Canadian Partnership Approach. The Review Team strongly supports the rationale for the CP Program and its role within the Centre. It is particularly impressed with the utility and effectiveness of the Program's numerous small investments in Canadian NGO's, universities and international development-focused organizations.

Rationale

The Canadian Partnerships Program seeks to ensure IDRC's active presence in the Canadian development research community.²⁷ There is no doubt that in general the CP Program is meeting this global objective. It has also substantially met its own five specific objectives:

- it has built and maintained long term relationships with key Canadian institutions
- it has strengthened the capacity and engagement of Canadian universities and civil society organizations in ID
- it has facilitated and strengthened Canada-Global South connections
- it has increased the number of Canadians learning about and engaging in ID
- it has contributed to the Centre's vision with respect to Canadian institutions.

It is also clear that the CP Program plays an important role within the International Development Research Centre. It is distinct from other Program Initiatives (PI) in that CP is 'relationship' oriented and "responsive" in nature, while other PIs are problem oriented and proactive. Unstated and less understood is the importance that its distinctive role plays within the organization. The wide range of relationships established by CP across the country helps keep the Centre grounded within the Canadian reality. In addition, its open-ended, flexible and responsive approach provides an ideal breeding ground for innovation. In this way, CP acts much like a scanning device for the Centre which has stimulated innovation and contributed to corporate flexibility to respond to unanticipated opportunities which might not have fitted within any of the other more clearly demarcated Program Initiatives. These characteristics should be maintained within the CP program.

Recommendation 2 – Designate Project Priority Theme Areas

It is recommended that the present loosely defined project categories be replaced with theme areas that relate more closely to those that have emerged from the CP Program, such as climate change, food security, youth and the diaspora. Here the Review Team is not supporting the idea of CP restricting its priority areas solely to current IDRC themes. This, in our view, would obviate the future possibility of uncovering new and potentially interesting lines of inquiry. Targeted strategies need to be launched to realize specified priority themes.

Rationale

The CP Program comes into contact with a many networks. It could consider putting more energy into supporting networks of Canadians – "a Canadian Networking Program." The value of retaining the flexibility and responsiveness of CP has been stressed by the Review Team and these characteristics have been evident across all categories of projects. However, it is time for CP to be somewhat more demanding – particularly as it sharpens its objectives and expectations. It will be important to focus on designated project priority areas.

It is time (after seventeen years of operation) to become more specific about what the CP Program actually hopes to achieve with its designation of themes/categories. Based upon its experience, it should consider focussing on selected thematic priorities and developing specific strategies to reach them. This step will enable CP to identify more clearly the areas it wishes to support and will bring greater clarity to its allocation process. As a consequence, the CP approach should become more transparent, systematic, broadly advertised, and open to people and organizations from across the country.

Recommendation 3 – Develop “New” Canadian Partnership Strategies

It is recommended that CP work on a two track strategy, focused on both strengthening its long standing relationships, as well as actively developing designated theme areas including those it has already identified. The CP Program should consider renewing its efforts to reach out to groups and institutions outside Central Canada.

Rationale

The Program is at a change point. Seasoned staff members are retiring at a time when new parameters will need to be set. Strong ties have been made between the Centre and a part of the Canadian research and development community – some of those linkages should be reviewed and some should remain. Canada’s level of interest in Global Citizenship has changed a great deal since 1992. Increased immigration, changing perspectives on security in the post 9/11 era, and the growing internationalism of Canadian universities have contributed to this change. Nevertheless, while its strategies may need to change to fit the times, its corporate niche as the focal point for Canadian partnerships and its ‘port of entry’ for initiatives that ‘don’t quite fit within the Program Initiatives,’ remain important. There continues to be a need for a part of IDRC that is not programmatic – a place that can respond – where something new can be tried and innovation is encouraged. Preserving the flexibility of the Program will be an essential element. Resources need to be reserved for this purpose.

The CP Program has worked on developing relationships with key ID partners across Canada. The interviews and the on-line survey indicate that this effort has been and is appreciated. The unintended result has been that a concentration of grant recipients can be found in Central Canada as the tables in this Review illustrate. Individual outreach initiatives to new partners and areas across the country have been reported by CP staff, but no focussed strategy has been identified by the Review Team. Such a strategy would improve on the current geographic imbalance/ distribution of resources/projects allocated to the various regions of the country.

The Program needs to reach out further afield in Canada to locate potentially interested players from a diversity of backgrounds and geographic locations, thus correcting the current imbalance. Some ideas that have been mentioned during the Review include engaging Community Colleges across Canada, increasing contacts with the multi-cultural and diaspora communities. CP can remain responsive by designating some resources for unidentified priorities while at the same time having some identified themes and geographic priority areas for outreach.

Recommendation 4 – Improve Transparency in Selection

It is recommended that specific selection criteria for each project priority area should be defined to support greater transparency and for the sake of clarifying the confusion currently evident around the project eligibility and intake process. These priorities should be advertised publically and thus should be written with enough precision to shape the expectations of applicants. This action would reduce the volume of proposals to manageable proportions. It is also recommended that the selection criteria and

expectations for core partners be redefined to open the possibility for additional institutional participation.

Rationale

The Review Team found that CP had evolved a careful selection process which was heavily influenced by the availability of limited human and financial resources. However, a number of partner interviews have indicated that these practices have given rise in recent times to a perception that the program is not transparent. While its eligibility criteria for small grants are posted on the IDRC web site, the overall project eligibility and selection criteria are not explicitly identified, nor are its processes of granting funding continuity. While implicit criteria appear to be utilized by CP and careful risk management practices exhibited, the confusion surrounding the selection and graduation procedures seem out of tune with the overall emphasis place upon responsiveness and flexibility. It appears to the Review Team that a continuous proposal intake process such as the one utilized currently could be retained in order to maintain a level of responsiveness and flexibility to emerging demands. The implicit criteria being used by Program officers noted earlier in this report if rendered explicit, could provide a useful point of departure to clarify the selection process.

Recommendation 5 – Stress Innovation & Flexibility

It is recommended that CP maintain the current diversity of projects while recognizing the role of small grants as a key part of the flexibility of the CP Program. Small grants encourage experimentation and risk-taking which is usually less feasible in large projects. They also greatly increase the constituency and numbers of CP partners served, in addition to the potential for enabling multi-sector collaboration and innovation while effectively managing risk.

Rationale

In the opinion of the Review Team, it would be a huge mistake to buy into the idea that “if it isn’t big, it doesn’t really count”. One of the great successes of the CP Program has been its ability to provide small funding for a diverse range of activity. The interviews with stakeholders are full of instructive examples of ways that small dollars have helped support excellent projects in terms of impact on and engagement of Canadians. They also enable Canadian NGOs and universities to reach out to Southern partners in small, but significant ways.

Recommendation 6 – Implement Project Self-Evaluation

It is recommended that all grant recipients be asked to provide a self-evaluation of their work in relation to the relevant CP objectives. Its length and depth should be reasonable and commensurate with the size of the allocation. This action would both enhance the quality of the projects and provide a simple measure of accountability.

Rationale

CP has made a recognized and welcomed effort to build relationships and to avoid the usual bureaucracy which often accompanies grant applications and funding. As many interviewees and a significant number of those surveyed noted, this unique partnership building process has set CP apart from many traditional funding agencies. Part of this equation has been a simplified reporting and accountability regime with requirements adjusted to the magnitude and complexity of grants and institutional arrangements. Core and institutional partners who receive annual allocations based upon negotiated arrangements, have been

expected to undertake independent evaluations on a periodic basis. These evaluations were thorough and informative although not always outcome focussed. The vast majority of CP grants (as the tables show) were small and many were non-repetitive. In such cases, monitoring was done on a case by case basis by the Program officer when possible and evaluations were often focussed on activities, not outcomes or in the case of the many smaller grants, not required. As the Review notes, there are many instructive and encouraging stories which could be obtained from even the smaller grant recipients and these should be gathered.

Recommendation 7 – Encourage joint University – NGO Projects

It is recommended that the CP Program – in its next phase – should consider renewing its efforts to do something about the collaboration between universities and Canadian NGOs by ear-marking funding to encourage the development of joint projects. Also CP should ensure that projects supported in universities address the practical needs of international development and that they incorporate student training whenever feasible.

Rationale

Canadian universities have managed to partner with a number of interesting NGOs in the South, but they have largely ignored interesting, innovative activity undertaken by Canadian NGOs. The CP Program should consider renewing its efforts to do something about this collaboration gap by allocating funding to encourage the development of joint university- NGO projects. The Review Team also noted the potential for exploring new forms of internal partnerships within IDRC such as with the PIs and the regional offices – some exist, but more linkages could have interesting potential.

Recommendation 8 – Initiate a CP Communication Strategy

It is recommended that a communication strategy for the “new” CP be created which disseminates the message internally and externally about the nature of CP, especially its uniqueness. It should stress the opportunities – the stories about effective partnerships, networking, knowledge-sharing and engagement, as well as its responsiveness and the North-South linkages enabled by the Program.

It is also recommended that in order make project information, the CP experience and its stories more accessible to those inside and outside IDRC, a reshaped information management system which is more user-friendly is needed. Additionally, the nature of CP should be more clearly articulated and evident on the IDRC web site.

Rationale

Given the breadth, ingenuity and innovation demonstrated by the CP Program, it needs to strengthen its communication capacity. The Centre is missing an opportunity to show how it supports the Canadian International Development community and its relationships with partners in the South. The interviews brought forward numerous stories regarding the outcomes of the grants – they demonstrated that even a short story is still worth telling. CP was lacking a well designed communications strategy which could also be designed to obtain input, to reach, as well as to ‘listen’ to different groups of people who are ‘out there’ and have new ideas and innovations.

The Review Team also became aware of the limitations of the current IDRC information management system which was found by many insiders and others not to be user friendly.

Endnotes

¹ IDRC Web site

² IDRC Web Site

³ Corporate Strategy and Program Framework 2005-2010

⁴ CP Strategy Document

⁵ CP Strategy Document

⁶ IDRC, Presentation to External Review Team, T. Dottridge, March 11, 2009, page 9

⁷ CP Strategy Document

⁸ Evaluation Unit website

⁹ IDRC offer of Contract dated March 2, 2009, New Economy Development Group Inc., page 2

¹⁰ Survey response rate – Based upon his experience at the York University's Institute for Social Research, a response rate of 76 out of 235 delivered questionnaires is a good rate of return. Bill Found reported that one normally expects a response rate of about 20 percent from people receiving questionnaires from an organization with which they are affiliated. This survey response rate was 32 percent and he felt that one is certainly justified in saying that the response rate is highly gratifying. It is remarkable considering the time of year that the survey was administered, and considering that some of the names on the survey list go back almost five years.

¹¹ External Review Work Plan, page 1

¹² GMO through USC; conference on Middle East;

¹³ PIs work with Canadian universities and NGOs, there is the Challenge Fund and Global Health Research Initiative.

¹⁴ Participatory research seeks to de-elitise and demystify research to make it an intellectual tool which ordinary people can use to improve their lives. The knowledge that is generated is used to promote actions for change or to improve existing local actions. Participatory research was popularized through the 80's and 90's hence became an ideal entry point for CP to create partnerships with Canadian NGOs working with southern partners. Action research grew out of the Latin American movement spearheaded by Freire and Fals Borda. Essentially action research (or participatory action research – PAR) is research which involves all relevant parties in actively examining together current action (which they experience as problematic) in order to change and improve it.

¹⁵ Action Research is a reflective process of progressive problem solving led by individuals working with others in teams or as part of a "community of practice" to improve the way they address issues and solve problems, Wikipedia.

¹⁶ SAS; North South; IISD

¹⁷ AUCC, CCIC; CASID; North South; IISD; CASLS

¹⁸ CIGI declined considering becoming a Core Partner and IDRC management decided that the Canadian Coalition for Global Health would fit more appropriately within an IDRC Program area.

¹⁹ For example CIGI.

²⁰ IDRC Corporate Strategy and Program Framework, 2005-2010 Page 4-1

²¹ ²¹ CP's Strategy (2005-2010), Page IV

²² Reference Human Rights Information and Documentation Systems International at its web site – www.huridocs.org

²³ AUCC, UniWorld UniMonde, Diaspora article, March 2009, www.docstoc.com/docs/14918786/Brain-drain-Brain-gain

²⁴ Rated according to: High = 60% frequency and over. Medium = 30% frequency and over and Low = up to 30%. Our sample (45 in total) pertains to the individual Partner interviews and not to the number of projects (some Partners were interviewed twice, some interviews were done with different respondent and many Partners were managing more than one project).

²⁵ A sixth, CCASLS was a core partner until recently

²⁶ CP provides 13% of the International Relations Division budget in 2009-10

²⁷ IDRC Web site.

ANNEXES

ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE

ANNEX B: ON-LINE SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

ANNEX C: LIST OF PROJECTS SAMPLED

ANNEX D: ON-LINE SURVEY RESULTS SUMMARIES

ANNEX E: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

ANNEX F: DATA ANALYSIS OF GRANT RECIPIENTS

ANNEX G: PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN – GRANT RECIPIENTS

ANNEX H: LIST OF COMMON QUESTIONS

ANNEX I: LIST OF DOCUMENTS

ANNEX J: OUTCOMES-INDICATORS FRAMEWORK

Annex A: Terms of Reference

Overview of Canadian Partnerships' Program

Of all the Centre's programs, OP (in the Special Initiatives Division) is the one that responds most directly to requests from the Canadian development and research community¹. It does this with a view to promoting links within this community among its various members, as well as between this community and developing country researchers and practitioners interested in knowledge-oriented activities for development. The program supports activities that underscore the mutual interest of Canadians and citizens of developing countries in studying and taking action on global issues and questions of international development ("Canada in the World, the World in Canada"). In addition to its relations with the Canadian development and research community in general, one particular element of its niche is the support provided to Canadian non-governmental/civil society organizations that are interested in undertaking research, strengthening their research capacity and promoting the use of knowledge in development.

The Program also acts as the focal point for the corporate relationship with a few Canadian research institutions². CF's support is not usually aimed at particular themes or issues, but rather focuses on varied approaches to strengthening Canadian contributions to knowledge on international development, with emphasis on direct connections with developing country colleagues and institutions. CP works broadly in the areas defined by the Centre's four program areas, but does not usually fund proposals, that fall directly into the core subject matter of the Centre's Program Initiatives. Collaboration and information exchange with other programs, including proposal review, are an important part of the way the CF program works.

Canadian Partnerships Review objectives and questions

- a. Assess the extent to which the Program is meeting its objectives and aims, assess how risks to the achievement of the program objectives were identified and managed, as set out in its prospectus/strategy, and identify any evolution in objectives
 - i) Describe and assess the progress of the Program towards reaching its objectives.
 - ii) Identify any evolution in program objectives and/or in interpretation of program objectives, and any adaptations that the Program is making to changing contexts, opportunities and constraints.
 - iii) Assess the appropriateness of the risk identification process and the effectiveness of the risk mitigation strategies put in place to support the achievement of program objectives.

¹ This includes individual universities, research institutions and non-governmental organizations and their representative bodies (learned societies, associations, coalitions and consortia)

² Such as the North-South Institute, the Centre for International Governance Innovation and the International Institute for Sustainable Development.

- iv) Assess the value the Program's continuing niche as a primary vehicle for the centre to respond to requests from Canadian institutions, as well as a central interlocutor for the Centre to relate more broadly to the Canadian development and research community.
- b. Document the results of the Program (i.e., outputs, reach, outcomes, and main research findings) and analyse their influence
 - i) Review the Program's outputs³ to date, and comment on their quality⁴ as perceived by the appropriate sectoral/regional experts, intended audiences, users and/or stakeholders.
 - ii) Describe and analyze the influence of the Program through its outcomes and the sustainability of those outcomes: the Program's reach⁵; the strategies which contributed to the outcomes; and any constraining or facilitating factors or risks (internal/external to the Program, internal/external to the Centre). This should take into account, but need not be limited to the following:
 - the effectiveness of the Program at promoting the dissemination, communication, and utilization of project results (including research findings where appropriate);
 - the contributions of the Program to building or strengthening capacities of researchers, organizations, research users, and institutions
 - the contributions of the Program, to inform policy-related work;
 - any changes in relationships, actions or behaviours of project partners and other project stakeholders (individual, organizations, groups, etc.). including *any* relationships that the Program effected which contributed to development results (e.g., formation of networks, involvement of stakeholders, collaboration among researchers, etc.);
 - any contributions of the Program to a greater understanding and consideration of inclusion of equity perspectives (e.g. gender, age, geography) in research *and* research processes (amongst program partners and within the field of research); and
 - any other outcomes.

³ Outputs include, but are not limited to, research reports and publications, websites and electronic lists produced, conferences, workshops and their proceedings, etc.

⁴ Quality is to be based on consideration of their scientific merit as assessed in relation to the relevant disciplines/fields, their relevance and appropriateness given the intended audience(s) and user(s), and context(s), and the purposes and objectives of the program.

⁵ Reach is defined as how actors interacted with and were affected by their engagement with the activities and/or results of the program.

iii) Describe and analyse the Program's main experiences and findings on promoting links with Canada's development and research community as outlined in the Program's prospectus/strategy.

- identify what conclusions can be drawn from projects' results (including research findings where appropriate) and any contracted research working papers, and/or synthesis work conducted by the Program and/or its partners;
- assess the overall quality of project results (including research findings where appropriate), and their contribution to international, policy, and academic debates, discourse, and/or understanding of the topic(s) under study; and
- if appropriate, identify any particularly innovative methodologies or project results.

The evaluation should provide key recommendations of the support of research for development and issues for the Centre to consider for this program

(Reference: *Offer of Contract – New Economy Development Group, Inc. Contract No.: 112298*)

Annex B: On-Line Survey Instrument - English

date
name

Hello,

As you may know, the International Development Research Centre is undertaking a review of its Canadian Partnerships Program – the first such review since the Program began. We have been contracted to undertake the review, and IDRC has provided your name as a contact person for a project or program which has received funding under the CP Program. As part of our assessment we are conducting an on-line survey of all those who have received such funding, and we would greatly appreciate your participation. To complete the survey just click on the link below. Completion of the survey will take no more than fifteen minutes. We are using a standardized questionnaire, so if some questions do not appear to fit your project/program particularly well, just select the “no comment” response. Your responses will be held in the strictest confidence, and only aggregate survey results will be used in our analysis.

Please click the following link to complete the survey (note: if the link fails to open a new window, please copy the URL link into your browser to access the survey):

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=ZQmS8_2bC_2b7kXO0Q4MDuFoig_3d_3d

Your responses to the survey will provide us with information of fundamental importance. Thank you very much for your assistance. If you have any questions concerning the survey, please write to Bill Found at wfound@yorku.ca.

With thanks,

Dal Brodhead and Wendy Quarry (New Economy Development Group)
Bill Found (University Professor Emeritus, York University)

IDRC CANADIAN PARTNERSHIPS REVIEW
ON-LINE SURVEY

PLEASE SELECT THE MOST APPROPRIATE RESPONSE TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. WRITE-IN COMMENTS ARE REQUESTED FOR THE LAST TWO QUESTIONS. JUST CLICK THE “SUBMIT” BUTTON AT THE END OF THE SURVEY WHEN YOU HAVE ENTERED ALL OF YOUR RESPONSES. THANK YOU.

1. To what extent are you familiar with the objectives of the Canadian Partnerships (CP) Program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

2. To what extent do members of your project/program consider themselves to be “partners” with IDRC?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

3. To what extent has the CP Program been responsive to requests for support?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

4. To what extent has the CP Program been flexible in negotiations regarding your project?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

5. To what extent have team members from the CP Program been pro-active in helping to shape your project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

6. To what extent do you and/or other members of the project/program receive substantive support and advice (in addition to financing) from the team at the CP Program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

7. To what extent do members of the CP team seek advice from you or other members of the project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

8. To what extent has IDRC provided clear guidance and documentation concerning its expectations for the project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

9. To what extent has the CP Program supported effective partnerships between Canadians and researchers in the Global South through your project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

10. To what extent has the CP Program supported high-quality research in your unit through your project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

11. To what extent has the CP Program supported high-quality research for your Southern partners through your project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

12. To what extent has the CP Program supported human rights through your project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

13. To what extent has the CP Program supported sustainable development through your project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

14. To what extent has the CP Program supported gender equity through your project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

15. To what extent has the CP Program supported truly innovative activity through your project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

16. To what extent have you been encouraged by the CP Program to evaluate your project/program?

greatly moderately somewhat slightly not at all no comment

17. How would you rate administrative relations and communication with the CP team at IDRC?

excellent good moderately good fair poor no comment

18. How would you rate the impact of your project for your Southern partners?

very positive positive slightly positive none negative no comment

19. Who have been the major beneficiaries through your project/program? (please select one only)

Southern partners both Southern and Canadian partners Canadian partners no comment

20. Have you been introduced to any new networks of researchers through your participation in your project/program?

yes no no comment

21. How would you assess the quality of the partnership between Canadian members of your project/program and colleagues from the Global South? What measures might one use to assess the quality of such relationships? (write-in comments will be appreciated)

22. Have you any additional thoughts, reflections, or advice concerning the CP Program? (open-ended comments will be appreciated)

Thank you very much. Please click the “Submit” button below to complete the survey.

Annex B: On-Line Survey Instrument - French

date
name

Bonjour,

Comme vous le savez peut-être, le Centre de recherches pour le développement international (CRDI) entreprend un examen de son programme Partenariats canadiens (PC) – le premier examen depuis le début du programme. Nous avons été embauchés afin de réaliser cet examen, et le CRDI nous a fourni votre nom à titre de personne contacte pour un projet ou programme qui a reçu du financement du programme PC. Une partie de l'examen que nous réalisons est un sondage en ligne de toutes les personnes ayant reçu un tel financement, et nous apprécierions grandement votre participation. Afin de remplir le sondage, vous n'avez qu'à cliquer sur le lien ci-dessous. Le sondage prendra au plus quinze minutes à remplir. Nous utilisons un questionnaire standardisé, donc si certaines questions ne semblent pas s'appliquer à votre projet/programme, choisissez la réponse « sans commentaire ». Vos réponses seront traitées confidentiellement et seuls les résultats globaux seront utilisés dans notre analyse.

Veuillez cliquer ici pour répondre au sondage :

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=hQGLqRqd7q3ml_2fAtLyviTA_3d_3d

Si, pour quelque raison que ce soit, ce lien ne fonctionne pas, s'il vous plaît collez l'adresse URL dans votre navigateur pour avoir accès au questionnaire.
Merci!

Vos réponses au sondage nous donneront de l'information essentielle. Merci beaucoup pour votre aide. Si vous avez des questions à propos du sondage, veuillez contacter Bill Found à wfound@yorku.ca.

En vous remerciant,

Dal Brodhead et Wendy Quarry (Le groupe éconov développement – New Economy Development Group)
Bill Found (Professeur d'université émérite, Université York)

CDRI examen de Partenariats canadiens
Sondage en ligne

VEUILLEZ CHOISIR LA RÉPONSE LA PLUS APPROPRIÉE POUR CHACUNE DES QUESTIONS SUIVANTES. DES COMMENTAIRES ÉCRITS SONT REQUIS POUR LES DEUX DERNIÈRES QUESTIONS. CLIQUEZ SUR LE BOUTON « SOUMETTRE » À LA FIN DU QUESTIONNAIRE APRÈS AVOIR ENTRÉ TOUTES VOS RÉPONSES. MERCI!

1. Jusqu'à quel point connaissez-vous les objectifs du programme Partenariats canadiens (PC)?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

10. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que les membres de votre projet/programme se considèrent-ils « partenaires » du CRDI?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

11. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que le programme PC a répondu à vos demandes d'appui?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

12. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que le programme PC a été flexible lors de négociations concernant votre projet?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

13. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que les membres de l'équipe du programme PC ont été proactifs afin de vous aider à donner forme à votre projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

14. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que vous et/ou d'autres membres du projet/programme reçoivent de l'appui et des conseils importants (en plus du financement) de l'équipe du programme PC?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

15. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que les membres de l'équipe du PC vous ont demandé des conseils à vous ou à d'autres membres du projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

16. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que le CRDI vous a donné des conseils et des documents clairs par rapport à ses attentes pour le projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

17. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que le programme PC a appuyé des partenariats efficaces entre des Canadiens et des chercheurs de l'hémisphère Sud via votre projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

18. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que le programme PC a appuyé de la recherche de haute qualité dans votre département via votre projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

19. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que le programme PC a appuyé de la recherche de haute qualité pour vos partenaires du Sud via votre projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

20. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que le programme PC a appuyé les droits humains via votre projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

21. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que le programme PC a appuyé le développement viable via votre projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

22. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que le programme PC a appuyé l'équité de genre via votre projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

23. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que le programme PC a appuyé de l'activité vraiment innovatrice via votre projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

24. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que vous avez été encouragé par le programme PC à évaluer votre projet/programme?

grandement modérément quelque peu légèrement pas du tout sans commentaire

25. Comment évalueriez-vous les relations administratives et les communications avec l'équipe du PC du CRDI?

excellentes bonnes assez bonnes correctes pauvres sans commentaire

26. Comment évalueriez-vous l'impact de votre projet pour vos partenaires du Sud?

très positif positif assez positif aucun négatif sans commentaire

27. Qui ont été les principaux bénéficiaires de votre projet/programme?

partenaires du Sud tant les partenaires du Sud que canadiens partenaires canadiens
sans commentaire

28. Est-ce que vous avez pris connaissance de nouveaux réseaux de chercheurs via votre participation à votre projet/programme?

oui non sans commentaire

29. Comment évalueriez-vous la qualité du partenariat entre les membres canadiens de votre projet/programme et les collègues de l'hémisphère Sud? Quelles mesures pourraient être utilisées pour évaluer la qualité de telles relations? (des commentaires écrits seront appréciés)

30. Avez-vous des pensées, réflexions ou conseils additionnels en ce qui a trait au programme PC? (des commentaires ouverts seront appréciés)

Merci beaucoup! Veuillez cliquer sur le bouton « soumettre » ci-dessous pour compléter le sondage.

Annex C: List of Projects Sampled

(November, 2009)

Below is a revised listing of projects to be selected for examination by the Reviewers. The projects which have been added are marked in bold. The total number of projects by region matches the numbers planned in the Review work plan. See below for notes. An asterisk (*) in the right hand column indicates that the project was not sampled due to closure of the project, inability to contact or scheduling difficulties.

Region	Recipient type	Projects by Region	\$100k - \$500 k	\$40k– \$100k	\$15k– \$40 k	\$1k- \$15k	* - not sampled
B.C.	University	UBC	104033				
		UBC	103854				
		U. Victoria		103548		105087-032	
		U. Royal Rhodes		104937			
	NGO	Fogquest	103874				
		Harmony Foundation		105083			
		Drishti			104387-015		
		Drishti			103089		
	Theme - CED	CCEDNet				105087-008	
	Theme - health	Vancouver Island Health Society			105088-007		
	Theme - Aboriginal	One Sky				103089-015	*
Prairies	University	U. Saskatchewan	105138				
		U. Alberta-Edmonton		104599			
		U. Calgary			103928		*
		College Jeanne S				103736-049	*
	NGO	Mennonite CCC			103752-008		

Region	Recipient type	Projects by Region	\$100k - \$500 k	\$40k– \$100k	\$15k– \$40 k	\$1k- \$15k	* - not sampled
		Anishinabe A.				104386-053	
	Theme – Environment	Garden Institute				105087-020	*
	Theme – environment	IISD – Winnipeg/Ottawa					
Ontario	University	U. Carleton	105148				
		U. Ottawa	105156			1050887-054* 105087	
		U. Guelph	102479			103736-005	
		U. Western Ont.		103957			
		U. York			103089-014		*
		Univ. of Waterloo (CIGI)	103310 105121				
	NGO	Can. Coalition Global Health	103962				
		CUSO	105155	105013	105088-003		
		IUCN – Environment			103090-004		*
		PEN			103927		
		WUSC				105087-027	*
	Long Term	Mining Watch		104592			
		Inter Pares		103754			
		Kairos		105088-021			
		PAC	104981				
	Theme - Labour	Steelworkers Humanities Fund			103089-009		*
	Theme - Inuit	Nunavut Youth Abroad				103088-032	*
	Theme - Disability	Canadian Association for				105087-004	*

Region	Recipient type	Projects by Region	\$100k - \$500 k	\$40k– \$100k	\$15k– \$40 k	\$1k- \$15k	* - not sampled
		Community Living					
	Core	CCIC NSI CASID AUCC CCASLS	104588	104589 103091-002 103473		102397	*
Quebec	University	UQAM	104590		105088-004	105088-017	
		U. Concordia		104034			
		U. McGill			104387-010		
		CEGEP Outaouais			105088-006		
	NGO	SUCO				105087-046	*
		Alternatives Net	103094			104386-016	
		AMARC - Radio			104387-018		
	Theme - Aboriginal	Ass. of First Nations				103088-054	*
	Theme – Aboriginal Women	Continental Indigenous Women				103088-069	*
	Theme - Youth	World Youth Conference				105087-024	
	Theme – Government	Parks Canada				104386-033	
	Theme - Women	Marche des Femmes			103752-006		*
	Theme - Religious	L'Entraide Missionnaire			104387-009		*
Atlantic	University	U. Dalhousie	103842			104386-027	*
		U. St. Mary	104755		105087-010	105087-030	
		U. Memorial			103549		
		U. NB			104387-003		

Region	Recipient type	Projects by Region	\$100k - \$500 k	\$40k– \$100k	\$15k– \$40 k	\$1k- \$15k	* - not sampled
		St. Xavier University				103736-018	
	NGO	GPI Atlantic		103097			
		Falls Brook C. N.B.		104032			*
		ACEDI	105445				
	Other	GPI Atlantic			105088-014		

Notes

1. The columns marked as amounts of \$40k and less have selected by criteria related to Modalities & Themes and will be treated in less depth as noted in the Review's work plan.
2. Note that the core projects are not included here as they constitute a national level. The projects chosen for in-depth review were selected from the highest level funded for one recipient.
3. Projects removed from list are marked with an X on the right hand column – reasons can include non responsiveness, unavailable for interview, etc.
4. Within the selection of projects in the Universities an effort was made to look at some small projects, as well as the largest ones.
5. The sample also includes projects from a range of themes/sectors
6. Some organizations were selected because they had received funding over time, either increasing or diminishing.

CANADIAN PARTNERSHIPS (IDRC) REVIEW ON-LINE SURVEY

FOLLOWING ARE THE 22 QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE SURVEY. A TOTAL OF 76 PERSONS RESPONDED. FOR EACH QUESTION THE PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO SELECTED EACH RATING IS INDICATED IN PARENTHESES BELOW THE RATING. THE RATING WITH THE LARGEST RESPONSE APPEARS IN BOLD TYPE. THE WEIGHTED AVERAGE OF ALL RATINGS FOR EACH OF QUESTIONS 1 TO 18 IS ALSO INDICATED (5.0 IS THE MAXIMUM RATING, AND 1.0 IS THE LOWEST; “NO-COMMENT” RESPONSES ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE CALCULATIONS). QUESTIONS 21 AND 22 ASKED RESONDENTS TO SUBMIT WRITE-IN ANSWERS, WHICH ARE NOT LISTED HERE SINCE SOME OF THE RESPONSES REVEAL THE IDENTITY OF INDIVIDUAL RESONDENTS.

1. To what extent are you familiar with the objectives of the Canadian Partnerships (CP) Program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(18.4%)	(47.4%)	(18.4%)	(13.2%)	(1.3%)	(1.3%)

average rating: 3.69

31. To what extent do members of your project/program consider themselves to be “partners” with IDRC?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(32.9%)	(19.7%)	(23.7%)	(13.2%)	(5.3%)	(5.3%)

average rating: 3.65

32. To what extent has the CP Program been responsive to requests for support?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(68.4%)	(19.7%)	(5.3%)	(5.3%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)

average rating: 4.49

33. To what extent has the CP Program been flexible in negotiations regarding your project?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(67.1%)	(22.4%)	(5.3%)	(1.3%)	(2.6%)	(1.3%)

average rating: 4.52

34. To what extent have team members from the CP Program been pro-active in helping to shape your project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(30.3%)	(38.2%)	(15.8%)	(5.3%)	(7.9%)	(2.6%)

average rating: 3.80

35. To what extent do you and/or other members of the project/program receive substantive support and advice (in addition to financing) from the team at the CP Program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(30.3%)	(26.3%)	(17.1%)	(9.2%)	(11.8%)	(5.3%)

average rating: 3.60

36. To what extent do members of the CP team seek advice from you or other members of the project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(6.6%)	(26.3%)	(18.4%)	(11.8%)	(28.9%)	(7.9%)

average rating: 2.67

37. To what extent has IDRC provided clear guidance and documentation concerning its expectations for the project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(52.6%)	(28.9%)	(11.8%)	(2.6%)	(3.9%)	(0.0%)

average rating: 4.24

38. To what extent has the CP Program supported effective partnerships between Canadians and researchers in the Global South through your project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(50.0%)	(21.1%)	(6.6%)	(6.6%)	(5.3%)	(10.5%)

average rating: 4.16

10. To what extent has the CP Program supported high-quality research in your unit through your project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(48.7%)	(21.1%)	(7.9%)	(2.6%)	(10.5%)	(9.2%)

average rating: 4.04

11. To what extent has the CP Program supported high-quality research for your Southern partners through your project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(27.6%)	(26.2%)	(13.2%)	(6.6%)	(10.5%)	(15.8%)

average rating: 3.64

12. To what extent has the CP Program supported human rights through your project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(18.4%)	(22.4%)	(11.8%)	(7.9%)	(10.5%)	(28.9%)

average rating: 3.44

13. To what extent has the CP Program supported sustainable development through your project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(34.2%)	(21.1%)	(18.4%)	(3.9%)	(6.6%)	(15.8%)

average rating: 3.86

14. To what extent has the CP Program supported gender equity through your project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(31.6%)	(25.0%)	(14.5%)	(3.9%)	(3.9%)	(21.1%)

average rating: 3.97

15. To what extent has the CP Program supported truly innovative activity through your project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(55.3%)	(30.3%)	(3.9%)	(6.6%)	(1.3%)	(2.6%)

average rating: 4.35

16. To what extent have you been encouraged by the CP Program to evaluate your project/program?

greatly	moderately	somewhat	slightly	not at all	no comment
(35.5%)	(28.9%)	(11.8%)	(3.9%)	(7.9%)	(11.8%)

average rating: 3.91

17. How would you rate administrative relations and communication with the CP team at IDRC?

excellent	good	moderately good	fair	poor	no comment
(68.4%)	(23.7%)	(3.9%)	(1.3%)	(1.3%)	(1.3%)

average rating: 4.59

18. How would you rate the impact of your project for your Southern partners?

very positive	positive	slightly positive	none	negative	no comment
(47.4%)	(40.8%)	(3.9%)	(0.0%)	(0.0%)	(7.9%)

average rating: 4.47

19. Who have been the major beneficiaries through your project/program?

Southern partners	both Southern and Canadian partners	Canadian partners	no comment
(14.5%)	(75.0%)	(9.2%)	(1.3%)

20. Have you been introduced to any new networks of researchers through your participation in your project/program?

yes	no	no comment
(75.0%)	(18.4%)	(6.6%)

21. How would you assess the quality of the partnership between Canadian members of your project/program and colleagues from the Global South? What measures might one use to assess the quality of such relationships? (write-in comments will be appreciated)

(55 respondents provided write-in comments)

22. Have you any additional thoughts, reflections, or advice concerning the CP Program? (open-ended comments will be appreciated)?

(50 respondents provided write-in comments.)

Annex E: CP EXTERNAL REVIEW – LIST OF INTERVIEWS

	Name	Institution	Location/City
1	Gerry Barr	CCIC	Ottawa
2	Michael Bloomfield	Harmony Foundation	Victoria, B.C.
3	Alain Boutet	St. Mary's University	Halifax, N.S.
4	Bonnie Campbell	University of Quebec (UQAM)	Montreal
5	Gord Campbell	Coady Institute (telephone) St. Francis Xavier University	Antigonish, N.S.
6	Kathryn Campbell	University of Ottawa	Ottawa
7	Barry Carin	Centre for Global Studies, U. of Victoria	Victoria, B.C.
8	Jacques Carriere	CUSO	Costa Rica
9	Alexandre Charron	CCEDNET	
10	Jacques Chevalier	Carleton University	Gatineau, P.Q.
11	Ronald Colman	GPI Atlantic	Glen Haven N.S.
12	Brent Herbert Copley	IDRC	Ottawa
13	Roy Culpeper	North South Institute	Ottawa
14	Kathryn Cumin	Mining Watch	Ottawa
15	Helene De Celles	IDRC	Ottawa
16	Alison De Muy	CIGI	Waterloo, Ontario
17	Nina Di Stafano	AUCC	Ottawa,
18	Myriam Denov	McGill University	Montreal, P.Q.
19	Hugo do Las	U. of Western Ontario	London, Ontario
20	Tim Dottridge	IDRC	Ottawa
21	Judith Dueck	Mennonite Central Committee,	Winnipeg, Manitoba
22	John English,	Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI)	Waterloo, Ontario
23	Derek Fraser	Centre for Global Studies, U. of Victoria	Victoria, B.C.
24	Dr. Alice Gaudine	Memorial University	St. Johns
25	Alain Grandbois	CRDI	Montreal, P.Q.
26	Louise Guenette	IDRC – Communications	Ottawa
27	Budd Hall	U. of Victoria	Victoria, B.C.
28	Isobel Harry	PEN Canada	Toronto
29	Gail Hochachka	DRISHTI	Smithers, BC
30	Idalia Ivon Periera	University of Alberta	Edmonton, Alberta
31	Pari Johnston	AUCC	Ottawa,
32	John Kierney	Coastal Communities	Nova Scotia
33	Gisele Morin-Labatut	IDRC (retired)	Ottawa
34	Michel Lambert	Groupe Alternatives	Montreal, P. Q.
35	M. Le Li	University of Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
36	David Malone	IDRC – President	Ottawa
37	Stuart McCook	CCASLS, University of Guelph	Guelph, Ontario

	Name	Institution	Location/City
38	Rohinton Medhora	IDRC	Ottawa
39	Marguerite Mendell	Concordia University	Montreal
40	John Mihevc	KAIROS, Canada	Toronto
41	Luc Mougeot	IDRC – CP	Ottawa
42	Susan Murray	IDRC – Communications	Ottawa
43	Vic Neufeld	Canadian Coalition for Global Health Research	Hamilton, Ontario
44	Zoe Nielsen	Simon Fraser University	Burnaby, B.C.
45	Laurel O’Connor,	University of Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
46	Maureen O’Neil	Canadian Health Services Research Foundation	Ottawa
47	Roland Paris	University of Ottawa	Ottawa
48	Adriana Paz Ramirez	U.B.C., CEBEM	Vancouver, B.C.
49	Michael Pennock	Vancouver Island Health Authority	Vancouver Island, B.C.
50	Alan Rix, retired	IDRC	Ottawa
51	Kate Roberts	CUSO	Costa Rica
52	Nicola Ross	<u>Alternatives</u> Journal, University of Waterloo	Waterloo, Ontario
53	Terri Roulette-McCartney	Anishinabe A., - Youth Action International	Birtle, Manitoba
54	David Runnalls	IISD	Ottawa & Winnipeg
55	Julia Sagebien	Dalhousie University & University of Puerto Rico	Puerto Rico
56	Benito Serrano	U. of Western Ontario	London, Ontario
57	Daniel Schwanen	Centre for International Governance Innovation (CIGI)	Waterloo, Ontario
58	Robert Schemenauer	Fogquest	Kamloops BC,
59	Susan Savage	Coady Institute St. Francis Xavier University	Antigonish, N.S.
60	Chris Smart	IDRC (retired)	Ottawa
61	Marcelo Solervicens	World association of Community Radio	Montreal
62	Gauri Srinivasen,	CCIC - Canadian Council for International Cooperation	Ottawa, Ontario
63	Bob Stock	University of Saskatchewan	Saskatoon, Saskatchewan
64	Jean Symes	Inter Pares	Ottawa, Ontario
65	Bernard Taylor	Partnership Africa Canada	Ottawa
66	Juan Tellez	ACEDI	
67	Rebecca Thiessen	RMC	Kingston, Ontario
68	Sandra Thomson	DRISHTI	Smithers, BC
69	Mario Torres	CEBEM	Ottawa, Ontario
70	Henry Veltmeyer	CASID and St. Mary’s	Halifax, N.S.
71	Ann Weston	North South Institute	55 Murray Street, Ottawa
72	Loredana Marchetti	IDRC	Ottawa, Ontario

September 9, 2009

Annex F: Data Analysis of CP Grant Recipients, 2005 – 2009.

List of Tables:	Page
Table 1. Breakdown of Organization Type in CP Review	1
Table 2. Project Duration	2
Table 3. Provincial Breakdown of Total Projects	2
Table 4. Provincial Breakdown of Projects by Four Levels of Funding	3
Table 5. Breakdown of Educational Institutions by Province	3
Table 6. Breakdown of NGO Projects by Province	4
Table 7. Projects by Province and Organization Type.	4
Table 8. Project Value by Province and Organization Type	5

Table 1. Breakdown of Organization Type in CP Review (*Revised*)

Type	# Organizations (%)	# Projects (%)	\$ Value (%)
Core Partner	4 (2.15)	9 (2.24)	\$2,209,635 (15.64)
Educational Institution	39 (20.97)	155 (38.56)	5,025,088 (35.56)
NGO	130 (69.89)	222 (55.22)	6,196,455 (43.86)
Other*	13 (6.99)	16 (3.98)	697,793 (4.94)
Total	186 (100)	402 (100)	\$14,128,971 (100)

* Other: Groups include government departments, one consortium, individual consultancies, and stand alone conferences.
Source: Provincial Breakdown of CP Grant Recipients, IDRC, 2009-04-08.

Table 2. Project Duration

Total Projects	Under 2 years	2 – 3 years	3 + years	Unknown*
402	288	8	43	63

* Unknown: projects that have started within the last year. Not enough information available to determine their term.
Sources: Contacts – sip – cp, IDRC, 2009-04-21; CP Grant Recipients, IDRC, 2009-04-05.

Table 3. Provincial Breakdown of Total Projects (*Revised*)

Province	Projects	% of Total	Value	% of Total
Alberta	14	3.48	\$188,518	1.33
B.C.	40	9.95	1,232,925	8.73
Manitoba	12	2.99	128,050	0.91
New Brunswick	2	0.49	70,000	0.50
Newfoundland	1	0.25	32,340	0.23
Nova Scotia	19	4.72	877,831	6.21
Ontario	202	50.25	8,845,105	62.60
Quebec	103	25.62	1,945,319	13.76
Saskatchewan	3	0.75	215,440	1.52
Other	6	1.49	593,443	4.21
Total	402	100.00	\$14,128,971	100.00

Source: Provincial Breakdown of CP Grant Recipients, 2005-2009, IDRC, 2009-04-08.

Table 4. Provincial Breakdown of Projects by Four Levels of Funding

	\$100 k +		\$40-<100 k		\$15-<40 k		< \$15 k			
Prov.	# Projects	Value	# Projects	Value	# Projects	Value	# Projects	Value	Total #	Total Value
AB	-	-	1	\$47,860	1	\$29,400	12	\$111,258	14	\$188,518
B.C	3	\$487,925	5	288,090	11	296,320	22	160,590	41	1,232,925
MB	-	-	-	-	4	69,100	8	58,950	12	128,050
NB	-	-	1	45,000	1	25,000	-	-	2	70,000
NL	-	-	-	-	1	34,320	-	-	1	34,320
NS	2	358,300	5	360,681	4	97,350	8	61,500	19	877,831
ON	23	5,612,200	21	1,253,325	50	1,182,280	107	797,300	201	8,845,105
QC	4	925,000	1	48,000	16	399,200	82	573,110	103	1,945,319
SK	1	212,440	-	-	-	-	2	3,000	3	215,440
Other	1	566,705	-	-	-	-	5	26,738	6	593,443
Total	34	\$8,162,570	34	\$2,042,956	89	\$2,155,990	245	\$1,767,455	402	\$14,128,971

Source: Provincial Breakdown of CP Grant Recipients, 2005-2009, IDRC, 2009-04-08.

Table 5. Breakdown of Educational Institutions by Province (*Revised*)

Province	# Educational Institutions	# Projects	% Total Projects (402)	\$ Value	% Total \$Value (\$14,128,971)
Alberta	4	13	3.23	\$185,018	1.31
B.C.	5	20	4.98	784,235	5.55
Manitoba	2	2	0.50	15,000	0.10
New Brunswick	1	1	0.25	25,000	0.18
Newfoundland	1	1	0.25	34,340	0.24
Nova Scotia	3	10	2.49	467,300	3.31
Ontario	14	70	17.41	2,331,362	16.50
Quebec	8	37	9.20	972,393	6.88
Saskatchewan	1	1	0.25	212,440	1.50
Total	39	155	38.56	\$5,025,088	35.57

Source: Provincial Breakdown of CP Grant Recipients, 2005-2009, IDRC, 2009-04-08.

Table 6. Breakdown of NGO Projects by Province

Province	#NGO's	% Total Org's (169)	# Projects	% Total Projects (402)	\$ Value	% Total Value (\$14,128,971)
AB	1	0.60	1	0.25	\$3,500	0.025
BC	11	6.50	18	4.47	423,690	3.00
MB	5	2.96	9	2.24	105,550	0.75
NB	1	0.60	1	0.25	45,000	0.32
NL	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
NS	3	1.77	9	2.24	410,531	2.90
ON	68	40.23	120	29.85	4,489,258	31.77
QC	40	23.66	62	15.42	715,926	5.07
SK	1	0.60	2	0.50	3,000	0.021
Total	130	76.92	222	55.22	\$6,196,455	43.85

Source: Provincial Breakdown of CP Grant Recipients, 2005-2009, IDRC, 2009-04-08.

Table 7. Projects by Province and Organization Type.

Province	Core Partner	Ed'l Inst.	NGO	Other	Total
AB	-	13	1	-	14
BC	-	20	18	2	40
MB	-	2	9	1	12
NB	-	1	1	-	2
NL	-	1	-	-	1
NS	-	10	9	-	19
ON	8	70	120	4	202
QC	1	37	62	3	103
SK	-	2	2	-	3
Other	-	-	-	6	6
Total Value	9	155	222	16	402

Source: Provincial Breakdown of CP Grant Recipients, 2005-2009, IDRC, 2009-04-08.

Table 8. Project Value by Province and Organization Type

Province	Core Partner	Educational Inst.	NGO	Other	Total
AB	-	\$185,018	\$3,500	-	\$188,518
BC	-	784,235	423,690	\$25,000	1,232,925
MB	-	15,000	105,550	7,500	128,050
NB	-	25,000	45,000	-	70,000
NL	-	32,340	-	-	32,340
NS	-	467,300	410,531	-	877,831
ON	\$1,984,635	2,331,362	4,489,258	39,850	8,845,105
QC	225,000	972,393	715,926	32,000	1,945,319
SK	-	212,440	3,000	-	215,440
Other	-	-	-	593,443	593,443
Total Value	\$2,209,635	\$5,025,088	\$6,196,455	\$697,793	\$14,128,971

Source: Provincial Breakdown of CP Grant Recipients, 2005-2009, IDRC, 2009-04-08.

Data Analysis, CP Review
J. McNamara
31-08-2009

Annex G: Provincial Breakdown – Grant Recipients

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Alberta					
University of Alberta	AB	\$47,860	104599	2007-2008	Special Projects
University of Calgary	AB	\$29,400	103928	2006-2007	Special Projects
Grant MacEwan College	AB	\$14,124	104387-006	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Grant MacEwan College	AB	\$13,830	104386-005	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
University of Calgary	AB	\$11,000	103088-035	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Athabasca University	AB	\$10,000	105087-013	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
University of Alberta	AB	\$10,000	103736-054	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
University of Calgary	AB	\$10,000	105087-041	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
University of Calgary	AB	\$10,000	104386-051	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
University of Calgary	AB	\$9,684	105087-023	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
University of Calgary	AB	\$7,120	103736-010	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Athabasca University	AB	\$7,000	104386-037	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
University of Calgary	AB	\$5,000	103088-016	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
The Garden Institute of Alberta	AB	\$3,500	105087-020	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Total	AB	\$188,518			
BC					
University of British Columbia	BC	\$264,700	104033	2006-2007	Special Projects
University of British Columbia	BC	\$123,225	103854	2006-2007	Special Projects
FogQuest	BC	\$100,000	103874	2006-2007	Special Projects
Royal Roads University	BC	\$72,090	104937	2008-2009	Special Projects
Harmony Foundation	BC	\$71,000	105083	2007-2008	Special Projects
University of Victoria	BC	\$60,000	103548	2005-2006	Special Projects
University of Victoria	BC	\$45,000	104982	2007-2008	Special Projects
University of Victoria	BC	\$40,000	105084	2007-2008	Special Projects
University of British Columbia	BC	\$35,000	103961	2006-2007	Special Projects
Environmental Youth Alliance	BC	\$31,750	104387-006	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
DRISHTI - Centre for Integral Action	BC	\$30,000	103089-004	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
DRISHTI - Centre for Integral Action	BC	\$30,000	104387-015	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
University of British Columbia	BC	\$26,420	104386-015	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
FogQuest	BC	\$25,950	103089-006	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
University of Victoria	BC	\$25,700	104894	2007-2008	Special Projects
Ecotrust Canada	BC	\$25,000	103752-012	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
The Sage Foundation, Halifax Initiative	BC	\$25,000	103979	2006-2007	Special Projects
Vancouver Island Health Authority	BC	\$22,000	105088-007	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Canadian Community Economic Development Network	BC	\$19,500	103752-019	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
DRISHTI - Centre for Integral Action	BC	\$13,000	103752-011	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
University College of the Fraser Valley	BC	\$12,000	105087-011	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Canadian Community Economic Development Network	BC	\$11,025	103088-003	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Canadian Community Economic Development Network	BC	\$10,000	105087-008	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
One Sky	BC	\$10,000	103089-015	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
University of Victoria	BC	\$10,000	103088-046	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
University of Victoria	BC	\$10,000	103088-063	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
University of Victoria	BC	\$10,000	103736-051	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
University of Victoria	BC	\$10,000	104386-028	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
University of Victoria	BC	\$10,000	105087-032	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
University of British Columbia	BC	\$7,100	105087-033	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Royal Roads University	BC	\$6,500	103736-007	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
University of British Columbia	BC	\$6,500	103088-055	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Land and People Information Sharing Society (LAPIS)	BC	\$5,850	103088-034	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Pacific People's Partnership	BC	\$5,000	103736-032	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Pacific People's Partnership	BC	\$5,000	104386-026	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Royal Roads University	BC	\$5,000	103088-027	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Simon Fraser University	BC	\$5,000	105087-047	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Environmental Youth Alliance	BC	\$3,600	103736-041	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Vancouver Island Health Authority	BC	\$3,000	104386-046	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
FORREX Forest Research Extension Partnership	BC	\$2,015	103088-028	2005-2006	Global Citizenship

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Total	BC	\$1,232,925			
MB					
Mennonite Central Committee Canada	MB	\$19,900	103752-008	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
Mennonite Central Committee Canada	MB	\$19,200	103089-002	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
Mennonite Central Committee Canada	MB	\$15,000	104387-011	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Mennonite Central Committee Canada	MB	\$15,000	105088-008	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)	MB	\$10,000	103736-011	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Menno Simons College	MB	\$10,000	103090-013	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Mennonite Central Committee Canada	MB	\$9,900	104387-022	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Canadian Foodgrains Bank	MB	\$7,500	104386-040	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Canadian Network for Environmental Education and Communication	MB	\$7,250	104386-003	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Anishinabe Atisokaywin Inc.	MB	\$5,300	104386-053	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Collège Jeanne-Sauvé	MB	\$5,000	103736-049	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Friends of Makerere in Canada	MB	\$4,000	103088-066	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Total	MB	\$128,050			
NB					
Falls Brook Centre	NB	\$45,000	104032	2006-2007	Special Projects
University of New Brunswick	NB	\$25,000	104387-003	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Total	NB	\$70,000			
NFLD					
Memorial University of Newfoundland	NFLD	\$32,340	103549	2005-2006	Special Projects
Total	NFLD	\$32,340			
NS					
Dalhousie University	NS	\$245,000	103842	2006-2007	Special Projects
Saint Mary's University	NS	\$113,300	104755	2007-2008	Special Projects
Genuine Progress Index Atlantic Society (GPI Atlantic)	NS	\$91,815	103097	2005-2006	Special Projects
Atlantic Community Economic	NS	\$78,866	102217	2005-2006	Special Projects

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Development Institute (ACEDI)					
Atlantic Community Economic Development Institute (ACEDI)	NS	\$70,000	103863	2006-2007	Special Projects
Halifax Initiative	NS	\$70,000	105445	2008-2009	Special Projects
Saint Mary's University	NS	\$50,000	103513	2005-2006	Special Projects
Atlantic Community Econ Dev Inst (ACEDI) - St-Mary's University	NS	\$27,650	105088-005	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Atlantic Community Economic Development Institute (ACEDI)	NS	\$25,200	105088-005	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Genuine Progress Index Atlantic Society (GPI Atlantic)	NS	\$24,500	103089-018	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
Genuine Progress Index Atlantic Society (GPI Atlantic)	NS	\$20,000	105088-014	2008-2009	Special Projects
St. Francis Xavier University	NS	\$12,000	103736-018	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Dalhousie University	NS	\$10,000	104386-027	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Saint Mary's University	NS	\$8,500	105087-030	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Saint Mary's University	NS	\$8,500	103088-020	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Saint Mary's University	NS	\$8,500	103736-023	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Saint Mary's University	NS	\$8,500	104386-020	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Dalhousie University	NS	\$3,000	103736-043	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Atlantic Community Economic Development Institute (ACEDI)	NS	\$2,500	105087-010	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Total	NS	\$877,831			
ON					
CASID/Canadian Journal of Development Studies	ON	\$609,600	104587	2007-2008	Core Partner
AUCC - LACREG	ON	\$500,000	105096	2008-2009	Special Projects
Carleton University	ON	\$497,340	105148	2008-2009	Special Projects
Canadian Coalition on Global Health Research	ON	\$366,180	103962	2007-2008	Special Projects
Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC)	ON	\$340,000	103092	2005-2006	Core Partner

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC)	ON	\$315,000	103762	2006-2007	Core Partner
Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC)	ON	\$315,000	104589	2007-2008	Core Partner
University of Ottawa	ON	\$287,600	105156	2008-2009	Special Projects
CUSO	ON	\$283,650	105155	2008-2009	Special Projects
CASID/Canadian Journal of Development Studies	ON	\$278,000	103091-001	2005-2006	Core Partner
Partnership Africa Canada (PAC)	ON	\$250,000	104981	2007-2008	Special Projects
Partnership Africa Canada (PAC)	ON	\$200,000	103970	2006-2007	Special Projects
The Centre for International Governance Innovation	ON	\$170,000	105121	2007-2008	Special Projects
The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (NPSIA)	ON	\$159,230	103652	2005-2006	Special Projects
Carleton University	ON	\$155,600	104597	2007-2008	Special Projects
Mining Watch Canada	ON	\$125,000	105149	2008-2009	Special Projects
Inter Pares	ON	\$120,000	105090	2008-2009	Special Projects
University of Guelph	ON	\$115,200	102479	2005-2006	Special Projects
Queen's University	ON	\$113,300	104755	2007-2008	Special Projects
AHEAD - VSO pilot	ON	\$111,500	104602	2008-2009	Special Projects
Canadian International Council	ON	\$100,000	105086	2007-2008	Special Projects
Partnership Africa Canada (PAC)	ON	\$100,000	102008	2005-2006	Special Projects
Partnership Africa Canada (PAC)	ON	\$100,000	104605	2007-2008	Special Projects
TeKnoWave Inc.	ON	\$85,000	103844	2006-2007	Special Projects
Mining Watch Canada	ON	\$80,000	104592	2007-2008	Special Projects
Canadian University Services Overseas (CUSO)	ON	\$78,120	105013	2007-2008	Special Projects
Association for Higher Education and Development (AHEAD)	ON	\$75,700	103450	2005-2006	Special Projects
HealthBridge Foundation of Canada	ON	\$65,200	104618	2007-2008	Special Projects
The Advocate Institute of Human Resources	ON	\$64,690	102987	2005-2006	Special Projects
Mining Watch Canada	ON	\$60,000	103313	2005-2006	Special Projects

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
University of Western Ontario	ON	\$60,000	103957	2006-2007	Special Projects
University of Western Ontario	ON	\$60,000	104030	2006-2007	Special Projects
Unitarian Service Commission	ON	\$59,790	103459	2005-2006	Special Projects
CASID	ON	\$57,285	104522	2007-2008	Core Partner
USC	ON	\$54,700	105088-020	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Inter Pares	ON	\$50,000	103754	2006-2007	Special Projects
Inter Pares	ON	\$50,000	104593	2007-2008	Special Projects
Mining Watch Canada	ON	\$50,000	103758	2006-2007	Special Projects
University of Ottawa	ON	\$49,270	105091	2008-2009	Special Projects
Partnership Africa Canada (PAC)	ON	\$49,220	103473	2005-2006	Special Projects
Tropical Conservancy	ON	\$44,350	103098	2005-2006	Special Projects
Canadian Institute for Environmental Law and Policy (CIELAP)	ON	\$40,000	103089-010	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
Globescan Incorporated	ON	\$40,000	104085	2006-2007	Special Projects
Kairos	ON	\$40,000	105088-021	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
CASID/Canadian Journal of Development Studies	ON	\$40,000	103091-002	2005-2006	Core Partner
Carleton University	On	\$35,000	105089	2008-2009	Special Projects
IUCN Academy of Environmental Law	ON	\$35,000	103090-004	2005-2006	Special Projects
Society for International Development	ON	\$35,000	104607	2007-2008	Special Projects
Carleton University	ON	\$35,000	103090-003	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
University of Ottawa	ON	\$35,000	103090-006	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
York University	ON	\$33,900	103090-002	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
Columbia Alternative Justice	ON	\$33,780	105088-013	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
York University	ON	\$31,617	103090-005	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
PEN Canada	ON	\$31,400	103927	2006-2007	Special Projects
University of Guelph	ON	\$30,500	104896	2007-2008	Special Projects
Horizons of Friendship	ON	\$30,000	105088-002	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
West African Human Rights Defenders Project	ON	\$30,000	103089-005	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC)	ON	\$29,750	102341	2005-2006	Core Partner
Canadian Council for International	ON	\$28,215	103089-007	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Cooperation (CCIC)					
University of Toronto	ON	\$27,005	103089-013	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
York University	ON	\$26,540	104387-023	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Participatory Development (PD) Forum	ON	\$25,000	103752-010	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
USC Canada	ON	\$25,000	104387-008	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Carleton University	ON	\$25,000	104865	2007-2008	Special Projects
University of Guelph	ON	\$25,000	104387-004	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
University of Ottawa	ON	\$25,000	103752-003	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
York University	ON	\$25,000	103089-014	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
York University	ON	\$25,000	103089-016	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
York University	ON	\$25,000	104387-007	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Canadian Foundation for the Americas (Focal)	ON	\$24,980	105088-011	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Steelworkers Humanity Fund	ON	\$24,430	103089-009	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
Participatory Development (PD) Forum	ON	\$23,000	103089-011	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
Partnership Africa Canada (PAC)	ON	\$22,750	103089-003	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
Street Kids International	ON	\$20,550	104387-002	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
York University	ON	\$20,500	103089-008	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
Canadian University Services Overseas (CUSO)	ON	\$20,063	105088-003	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Canadian Institute for Environmental Law and Policy (CIELAP)	ON	\$20,000	104387-014	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Organization for the Advancement of Aboriginal Peoples' Health	ON	\$20,000	104387-020	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Participatory Development (PD) Forum	ON	\$20,000	104387-017	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
UNICEF Canada	ON	\$20,000	103736-022	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
United Church of Canada	ON	\$20,000	104387-012	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Brock University	ON	\$20,000	103089-012	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
York University	ON	\$20,000	105088-012	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Amnesty International Canadian Section	ON	\$18,700	104387-013	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Canadian Community for Dialogue and Deliberation (C2D2)	ON	\$18,000	104386-035	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Inter Pares	ON	\$17,500	104387-021	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
York University	ON	\$16,900	104386-044	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$16,200	104601	2007-2008	Special Projects
York University	ON	\$16,000	104386-050	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Alternatives Inc.	ON	\$15,000	105087-021	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Corporate Knights/Waterlution	ON	\$15,000	103088-018	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Women & Environments International Magazine	ON	\$15,000	104386-045	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$15,000	105087-054	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
University of Toronto	ON	\$15,000	103736-050	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
University of Toronto	ON	\$13,280	105087-034	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
University of Toronto	ON	\$13,000	104386-012	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
2degreesC Inc.	ON	\$12,000	104386-041	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Canadian Asian Studies Association (CASA)	ON	\$12,000	105087-040	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Carleton University	ON	\$12,000	104386-005	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
University of Toronto	ON	\$11,025	103088-038	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
University of Toronto	ON	\$10,700	103088-015	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
African Diaspora Association of Canada (ADAC)	ON	\$10,600	104386-039	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Trent University	ON	\$10,450	103088-004	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
University of Toronto	ON	\$10,350	103736-024	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Alternatives Inc.	ON	\$10,000	105087-031	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Alternatives Inc.	ON	\$10,000	103088-047	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Alternatives Inc.	ON	\$10,000	103736-045	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Alternatives Inc.	ON	\$10,000	104386-047	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Canadian Association of African Studies	ON	\$10,000	105088-02x	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Canadian Association of Black Lawyers	ON	\$10,000	105087-035	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Canadian Crossroads International (CCI)	ON	\$10,000	103088-059	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)	ON	\$10,000	103088-023	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Canadian Friends of Somalia	ON	\$10,000	105087-015	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Canadian University Services Overseas (CUSO)	ON	\$10,000	103088-056	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Canadian University Services Overseas	ON	\$10,000	104387-024	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
(CUSO)					
Engineers Without Borders (EWB Canada)	ON	\$10,000	105087-012	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Green Teacher	ON	\$10,000	103088-051	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Inanna Publications and Education Inc.	ON	\$10,000	104386-017	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
International Development Ethics Association	ON	\$10,000	103736-017	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
MATCH International Centre	ON	\$10,000	103088-011	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
MATCH International Centre	ON	\$10,000	103736-012	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
McMaster University	ON	\$10,000	105087-049	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Nunavut Youth Abroad Program (NYAP)	ON	\$10,000	103088-032	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Pentafolio Multi-Media	ON	\$10,000	105087-002	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Project Ploughshares	ON	\$10,000	103736-015	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Tropical Conservancy	ON	\$10,000	103736-040	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Tropical Conservancy	ON	\$10,000	105087-009	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
USC Canada and Ethio-Organic Seed Association	ON	\$10,000	103736-025	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
World University Service of Canada (WUSC)	ON	\$10,000	103088-033	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
World University Service of Canada (WUSC)	ON	\$10,000	103736-034	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
World University Service of Canada (WUSC)	ON	\$10,000	104386-019	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
World University Service of Canada (WUSC)	ON	\$10,000	105087-027	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Carleton University and Pacific University	ON	\$10,000	103736-019	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Tropical Conservancy	ON	\$10,000	105087-052	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
University of Western Ontario	ON	\$10,000	105087-053	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
University of Guelph	ON	\$10,000	103736-005	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$10,000	105087-006	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$10,000	105087-036	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
University of Toronto	ON	\$10,000	103088-060	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
University of Toronto	ON	\$10,000	104386-042	2007-2008	Global Citizenship

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
University of Toronto	ON	\$10,000	105087-019	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$9,865	105087-044	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Engineers Without Borders (EWB Canada)	ON	\$9,270	105087-050	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Canadian Peacebuilding Coordinating Committee	ON	\$8,760	103736-055	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
United Church of Canada	ON	\$8,400	103088-041	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Canadian Environmental Network (CEN)	ON	\$8,000	104386-024	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Canadian Society for Ecological Economics	ON	\$8,000	104386-021	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$8,000	103088-002	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
York University	ON	\$8,000	105087-005	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Sierra Club of Canada	ON	\$7,700	103088-036	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
United Nations Association in Canada (UNAC)	ON	\$7,600	101361-037	2002-2003	Global Citizenship
University of Toronto	ON	\$7,500	103088-005	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
University of Waterloo	ON	\$7,500	103088-043	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
The Canadian Consortium for Health Promotion Research	ON	\$7,000	104386-011	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Voluntary Services Overseas (VSO) Canada	ON	\$7,000	104386-030	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$7,000	103736-008	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Canadian Association for the Study of International Development	ON	\$6,500	104386-013	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Sierra Club of Canada	ON	\$6,500	103088-039	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Sierra Club of Canada	ON	\$6,500	103736-029	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Trent University	ON	\$6,500	103736-006	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Canadian Association for African Studies	ON	\$5,350	105087-039	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
2degreesC	ON	\$5,000	105087-043	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Canadian Association for Community Living (CACL)	ON	\$5,000	105087-004	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Canadian Council of Professional Engineers (CCPE)	ON	\$5,000	103088-052	2005-2006	Global Citizenship

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Canadian Society for International Health (CSIH)	ON	\$5,000	103388-002	2005-2006	Special Projects
Democracy Education Network	ON	\$5,000	103088-049	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Médecins sans Frontières (MSF)	ON	\$5,000	101361-049	2002-2003	Global Citizenship
North-South Institute	ON	\$5,000	102397	2005-2006	Special Projects
Somali Agricultural Technical Group (SATG)	ON	\$5,000	105087-017	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
The Group of 78	ON	\$5,000	103088-031	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Laurentian University	ON	\$5,000	103090-015	2005-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
McMaster University	ON	\$5,000	103736-014	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Queen's University	ON	\$5,000	103736-035	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Tropical Conservancy	ON	\$5,000	105087-038	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$5,000	103088-037	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$5,000	103088-045	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
University of Toronto	ON	\$5,000	103736-044	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
University of Toronto	ON	\$5,000	104386-049	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$4,950	105087-007	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Bakavi School of Permaculture	ON	\$4,000	104386-034	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Canadian Commission for UNESCO	ON	\$4,000	103088-029	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Corporate Knights/Waterlution	ON	\$4,000	103736-033	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
HealthBridge Foundation of Canada	ON	\$4,000	104386-023	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
The Group of 78	ON	\$4,000	103736-030	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
McMaster University	ON	\$4,000	104386-025	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Queen's University	ON	\$3,600	105087-003	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Canadian-Palestinian Educational Exchange (CEPAL)	ON	\$3,500	103088-014	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
United Nations Association in Canada (UNAC)	ON	\$3,500	103088-017	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
United Nations Association in Canada (UNAC)	ON	\$3,500	105087-051	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Queen's University	ON	\$3,300	103088-061	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
University of Ottawa	ON	\$3,140	104386-002	2007-2008	Global Citizenship

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Association for Higher Education and Development (AHEAD)	ON	\$3,000	105087-028	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Canadian Institute for Environmental Law and Policy (CIELAP)	ON	\$3,000	105087-042	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives (CCPA)	ON	\$3,000	103736-021	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Society for International Development	ON	\$3,000	103736-052	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
The Group of 78	ON	\$3,000	104386-038	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Trent University	ON	\$2,500	104386-048	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Trent University	ON	\$2,500	105087-045	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Participatory Development (PD) Forum	ON	\$1,820	103088-044	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Canadian-Palestinian Educational Exchange (CEPAL)	ON	\$1,690	103736-046	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Queen's University	ON	\$1,500	105087-048	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
The Region of Waterloo Public Health Authority	ON	\$1,450	103088-040	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Total	ON	\$8,845,105			
QC					
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$400,000	104590	2007-2008	Special Projects
Canadian Council of Area Studies Learned Societies (CCASLS)	QC	\$225,000	104588	2007-2008	Core Partner
Alternatives Action and Communication Network for International Development	QC	\$150,000	103094	2005-2006	Special Projects
McGill University	QC	\$150,000	104600	2007-2008	Special Projects
Concordia University	QC	\$48,000	104034	2006-2007	Special Projects
McGill University	QC	\$35,000	104387-010	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Association Mondiale des Radios Communautaires (AMARC)	QC	\$30,000	104387-018	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Cégep de l'Outaouais	QC	\$30,000	105088-006	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$30,000	103374	2005-2006	Special Projects
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$28,900	103089-017	2005-2006	Global and Emerging Issues
Fondation pour une bibliothèque globale	QC	\$27,660	105088-015	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Association québécoise des organismes de coopération internationale (ACOQI)	QC	\$25,000	103752-002	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
Centre UBUNTU	QC	\$25,000	103752-004	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
L'Entraide missionnaire	QC	\$25,000	104387-009	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Marche Mondiale des Femmes	QC	\$25,000	103752-006	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
Centre international d'éducation aux droits humains (Equitas)	QC	\$24,640	105088-016	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Entr'aide missionnaire	QC	\$23,000	105088-019	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Forum International de Montréal (FIM)	QC	\$20,000	103375	2005-2006	Special Projects
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$20,000	103736-038	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (AMARC)	QC	\$15,000	105088-022	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$15,000	105088-004	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Corporation des bibliothécaires professionnels du Québec	QC	\$14,202	105087-018	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$13,540	104387-016	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$13,415	105088-017	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Université de Montréal	QC	\$13,325	103736-009	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Bibliothèque et Archives Canada/Library and Archives Canada	QC	\$13,000	104386-036	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
UQAM - IDRC co-publication	QC	\$13,000	105088-023	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Université du Québec en Outaouais	QC	\$12,540	105088-010	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Forum International de Montréal (FIM)	QC	\$12,380	105088-018	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Canadian Asian Studies Association	QC	\$12,000	104386-009	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Concordia University	QC	\$11,300	105087-022	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
McGill University	QC	\$11,300	103736-053	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
McGill University	QC	\$11,300	104386-010	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$10,450	103752-007	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
Alternatives Action and Communication Network for International Development	QC	\$10,350	103736-027	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Alternatives Action and Communication Network for International Development	QC	\$10,000	104386-016	2007-2008	Global Citizenship

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Centre d'étude et de coopération internationale (CECI)/Uniterra	QC	\$10,000	103736-039	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Congrès Mondial des Jeunes (World Youth Congress)	QC	\$10,000	105087-024	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Consensus International	QC	\$10,000	103088-065	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Institute of Cultural Affairs International (ICA International)	QC	\$10,000	105087-014	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Le groupe d'économie solidaire du Québec (GESQ)	QC	\$10,000	103088-007	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Université de Sherbrooke	QC	\$10,000	103736-020	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$10,000	103088-022	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Université du Québec en Outaouais	QC	\$10,000	103736-031	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Université du Québec en Outaouais	QC	\$10,000	105088-02x	2008-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Parks Canada Agency/Agence Parcs Canada	QC	\$9,800	105087-025	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Continental Network of Indigenous Women of the Americas	QC	\$9,680	103088-069	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Assemblée des Premières Nations du Québec et du Labrador	QC	\$9,400	103088-054	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Parks Canada Agency/Agence Parcs Canada	QC	\$9,200	104386-033	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Forum International de Montréal (FIM)	QC	\$8,850	104386-043	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$8,562	103752-014	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Université de Montréal	QC	\$8,000	105088-009	2008-2009	Global and Emerging Issues
Le groupe d'économie solidaire du Québec (GESQ)	QC	\$7,765	103736-013	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Le groupe d'économie solidaire du Québec (GESQ)	QC	\$7,500	104386-008	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Le groupe d'économie solidaire du Québec (GESQ)	QC	\$7,500	104386-008	2007-2008	Global citizenship
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$7,500	104386-014	2007-2008	Global Citizenship

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Association canadienne des sociologues et anthropologues de langue française (ACSALF)	QC	\$7,100	105087-026	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Association des économistes québécois	QC	\$7,000	105087-016	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
North American Forum on Integration/AXAMERICA	QC	\$7,000	103736-002	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Université de Montréal	QC	\$7,000	103736-026	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Université de Montréal	QC	\$6,500	105087-037	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
McGill University	QC	\$6,250	103752-020	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Alternatives Action and Communication Network for International Development	QC	\$6,000	103090-014	2007-2008	Global and Emerging Issues
Communautique	QC	\$6,000	103088-012	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
McGill Law Students Association	QC	\$6,000	104386-006	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
McGill Law Students Association	QC	\$6,000	104386-006	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Association québécoise pour la promotion de l'éducation relative à l'environnement (AQPERE)	QC	\$5,000	103088-026	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Centre de recherches et d'études des traditions amérindiennes (CRETA)	QC	\$5,000	103088-021	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Comité pour la justice sociale de Montréal/Social Justice Committee of Montreal	QC	\$5,000	104386-029	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Confédération des syndicats nationaux (CSN)	QC	\$5,000	103088-030	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
McGill Law Students Association	QC	\$5,000	103736-047	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
North American Forum on Integration/AXAMERICA	QC	\$5,000	103088-013	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
North American Forum on Integration	QC	\$5,000	104386-022	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Rights and Democracy	QC	\$5,000	103088-067	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Solidarité, Union, Coopération (SUCO)	QC	\$5,000	103088-057	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Solidarité, Union, Coopération (SUCO)	QC	\$5,000	105087-046	2008-2009	Global Citizenship
Université de Montréal	QC	\$5,000	103088-048	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Réseau citoyen de solidarité Iciéla	QC	\$4,950	105087-029	2008-2009	Global Citizenship

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
Marche Mondiale des Femmes	QC	\$4,915	103088-009	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Academic and Community Cooperation for Environmental Sustainability	QC	\$4,400	103736-028	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Association Mondiale des Radios Communautaires (AMARC)	QC	\$4,000	103088-064	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Solidarité Union Coopération (SUÇO)	QC	\$4,000	103736-042	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Assemblée des Premières Nations du Québec et du Labrador	QC	\$3,350	103088-008	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Société de développement communautaire de Montréal (SODECM)	QC	\$3,060	104386-007	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Urban Ecology Centre	QC	\$3,060	104386-007	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
École Polytechnique de Montréal	QC	\$3,000	103088-025	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$3,000	104386-031	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Université Laval	QC	\$3,000	103736-036	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Centre d'étude et de coopération internationale (CECI)	QC	\$2,800	103088-019	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Université de Sherbrooke	QC	\$2,481	104386-004	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Fondation pour une bibliothèque globale	QC	\$2,420	104386-018	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Communauté Togolaise au Canada	QC	\$2,000	103088-058	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Force Leadership Africain	QC	\$1,644	103088-068	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM)	QC	\$1,630	103088-042	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Université Laval	QC	\$1,500	104386-052	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Université Laval	QC	\$1,400	101908-049	2003-2004	Global Citizenship
Oxfam-Québec	QC	\$1,300	103088-006	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Canadian Association for Latin American and Caribbean Studies (CALACS)	QC	\$1,000	103736-037	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Carrefour Tiers Monde	QC	\$1,000	103088-010	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Carrefour Tiers Monde	QC	\$1,000	103088-062	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Ingénierie Sans Frontières Québec	QC	\$1,000	103736-048	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Espace Avenir	QC	\$25,000	103752-009	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
Université Laval	QC	\$500	104386-032	2007-2008	Global Citizenship
Total	QC	\$1,945,319			

PROVINCIAL BREAKDOWN OF CP GRANT RECIPIENTS 2005-2009*					
Institution	Prov.	Grant Amount	Routing Number	FY	Type
University of Saskatchewan	SK	\$212,440	105138	2008-2009	Special Projects
National Farmers Union	SK	\$1,500	103088-050	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
National Farmers Union	SK	\$1,500	103736-016	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Total	SK	\$215,440			
Other					
CEBEM/ CEBEM Intl, York U, UBC, SFU, McGill, CCEDNet	VAR	\$566,705	105119	2008-2009	Special Projects
Consultancy by Alidad Mafinezam	N/A	\$10,840	103752-005	2006-2007	Global and Emerging Issues
UBINIG	N/A	\$6,900	103736-003, 004	2006-2007	Global Citizenship
Ms. Eleanor Glor	N/A	\$5,000	101908-025	2003-2004	Global Citizenship
John Githongo	N/A	\$2,703	103088-053	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Dr. Lois James-Chételat	N/A	\$1,295	103088-024	2005-2006	Global Citizenship
Total		\$ 593,443.00			
GRAND TOTAL		\$14,128,971.00			

Annex H: List of Common Questions

IDRC CP REVIEW INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

COMMON QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS WITH SAMPLE PROJECTS/PROGRAMS

History and Background

1. What is the history of your relationship with the CP Program – i.e. how did you obtain support from the Program for your activity? Did you contact IDRC CP or vice versa? What was the nature of the process that led to a successful application?
2. How many activities/projects have you had funded by the CP Program? Describe each activity/project briefly. What forms of IDRC support other than the CP Program have you received over the years?
3. Who has been involved in this project/program – from Canada and from the South? What Canadians have visited Southern partners? What people from the South have visited Canada?
4. What are the objectives of your project/program? What are the major activities?
5. More specifically, what was/is the nature of the joint activities undertaken between Southern and Canadian partners in this project?

Partnerships

6. Did your contacts with the Southern partners pre-date this project? How far back do they go? How has the project helped to build that relationship?
7. What do you consider to be the qualities of a good North-South partnership? How would you measure or assess the quality of such a partnership? How would you rate the quality of the partnership in this project?
8. Do you consider IDRC's CP Program/Team to be one of your partners? Why?
9. Has your relationship with the CP Program changed over time? How?
10. How has your involvement with the CP Program affected your project – aside from the provision of funds? What activities/outputs are different because of CP's involvement? What proportion of project funding is provided by the CP Program?

Results/Outcomes

11. What are the outputs and outcomes of your project/program?
12. How are the results disseminated? List reports, publications, conferences, networks, films, websites, etc..
13. Have you noticed any long-term results from the project? What long-term results do you anticipate?
14. What is the research component in the project/program? How would you define “research” in this context?
15. How has the project affected the development of your research capacity? How has it affected the research capacity of your Southern partners?
16. Can you identify any truly innovative aspects of your project? Did the CP Team play any role in this innovation? Have they shown any particular interest in the innovation?
17. What did you do differently in this project/program because of CP involvement?
18. Can you identify any unexpected or unintended aspects of your project? Are these good or bad?
19. Has this project/program had any impacts on policy, either in Canada or in the South?
20. Does the project/program address any of the following themes: sustainability, human rights, equity, gender?
21. Will this project/program be sustained into the future? How?

Project/Program Management

22. What kinds of reports (written and oral) do you make to the CP Program? How often are these submitted? What kind of feedback from IDRC do you receive?
23. Has your project encountered significant difficulties or challenges? Did the CP Team help resolve these? Did the CP Team help you to anticipate difficulties, challenges or risks when you were preparing the funding proposal?
24. Has IDRC asked for or suggested that you evaluate your project? How is this accomplished? Who is involved in the assessment? How, specifically, are your Southern partners involved? What is IDRC’s involvement?

25. Have members of the CP Team ever sought your advice outside of the project?
Have you sought their advice?

Open-Ended

26. Do you have any other comments or questions concerning the CP Program?

(June 26, 2009)

Annex I: List of Documents

The list of documents reviewed is presented below. IDRC provided the Team with a great many documents over the course of the review period. Initially, the Evaluation Unit provided a binder with IDRC Corporate documents as well as material relating specifically to Canadian Partnerships. Later, a CD to each Evaluation Team member. The CD contained Canadian Partnership material on projects and evaluations of Core Partners. An effort has been made to list all of these documents since most were germane to the evaluation, but given the volume of material the list may have overlooked some papers.

In addition, CP staff provided the Team with sets of documents for each project. These were divided into six general categories:

(i) “approved” documents (including the Project Approval Documents, budgets, etc.); (ii) documents relating to correspondence and project development; (iii) monitoring and trip reports; (iv) reports regarding extensions or supplements; (v) “reports” (submitted at various stages by the project organizers); and (vi) “outputs”.

These documents have not been named here since they are too numerous to list. However, with these key documents, which sometimes totaled several dozen per project, it would have been difficult to have conducted informative interviews.

CP Program level documentation

Document Title	Date	Description of Document
1. Program prospectus/strategy, workplans, progress reports, programs of work and budgets (PWBs)		
Program Strategy		
Canadian Partnerships Strategy Special Initiatives Division 2005-2010	March-April 2005	Description of the CP program for 2005-2010
Special Initiatives Division 2005-2006 Annual Report	May 2006	Annual Report
Special Initiatives Division 2006-2008 Annual Report	May 2007	Annual Report
Special Initiatives Division 2007-2008 Annual Report	May 2008	Annual Report
Proposed Canadian Partnerships Strategy 2005-2010 SID	March 2005	PowerPoint presentation to the Board of Governors
CP Program: Report and Update on 2005-10 Strategy, Special Initiatives Division	June 2008	PowerPoint Presentation
Canadian Partnerships Project List 2005-2009		Core partnership and Major Institutional Support, Projects and Small Grants, Bound copy
Canadian Partnerships Project List 2005-2009: Lists and Abstracts		Core partnership and Major Institutional Support, Projects and Small Grants
Corporate Strategy and Program Framework 2005-2010	November 2004	Report
IDRC, Canadian Partnerships Program External Review – Progress Report		Table extracted from Progress Report
Ranked Recipient List 2002-2009		General Small Grant Recipients List, table extracted.
Interview Report – IDRC CP Program Review	June 2009	3 page extract
IDRC In Asia: Report to the Board of Governors, McGork and Fuchs	June 2008	Report
IDRC In Asia: Report to the Board of Governors, McGork and Fuchs	November 2006	Report
IDRC In Latin America and the Caribbean:: Report to the Board of Governors, Federico S. Burone	June 2008	Report

Document Title	Date	Description of Document
IDRC In Latin America and the Caribbean:: Report to the Board of Governors, Federico S. Burone	November 2006	Report
IDRC In Middle East and North Africa: Report to the Board of Governors, Eglal Rached	June 2008	Report
IDRC In Middle East and North Africa: Report to the Board of Governors, Eglal Rached	November 2006	Report
IDRC In Sub-Saharan Africa: Report to the Board of Governors, Constance J. Freeman, Gilles Forget	June 2008	Report
IDRC In Sub-Saharan Africa: Report to the Board of Governors, Constance J. Freeman, Gilles Forget	November 2006	Report
Memo to: Board of Governors	November 2006	Rohinton Medhora
Memo to: Board of Governors	May 2008	Rohinton Medhora
Workplans		
CP Workplan 2006-2007	2006	CP program objectives, evaluation plans, travel budgets, donor partnerships, dissemination activities and professional development activities for financial year 2006
CP Workplan 2007-2008	2007	CP program objectives, evaluation plans, travel budgets, donor partnerships, dissemination activities and professional development activities for financial year 2007
CP Workplan 2007-2008 Excel spreadsheets	2007	CP program objectives, evaluation plans, travel budgets, donor partnerships, dissemination activities and professional development activities for financial year 2007
CP Workplan April 2008- March 2009	2008	CP program objectives, evaluation plans, travel budgets, donor partnerships, dissemination activities and professional development activities for financial year 2008
CP Workplan April 2008- March 2009 excel Spreadsheets	2008	CP program objectives, evaluation plans, travel budgets, donor partnerships, dissemination activities and professional development activities for financial year 2008
Pipelines		
SID Pipeline 2005-2006		Excel table detailing funds managed by SID for 2005-06.
SID Pipeline 2006-2007		Excel table detailing funds managed by SID for 2006-07.
SID Pipeline 2007-2008		Excel table detailing funds managed by SID for 2007-08.
SID Pipeline 2008-2009		Excel table detailing funds managed by CP for 2008-09.
Programmes of Work		
Excerpt from IDRC's 2005-2006 Programme of Work and Budget (PWB)	March 2005	SID's programme of work for 2005-2006
Excerpt from IDRC's 2006-2007 Programme of Work and Budget (PWB)	March 2006	SID's programme of work for 2006-2007
Excerpt from IDRC's 2007-2008 Programme of Work and Budget (PWB)	March 2007	SID's programme of work for 2007-2008
Program of Work and Budget 2008-09	March 2008	IDRC's programme of work and budget 2008-2009. For SID's section, go to page 31 of document
2. Documents that describe overall strategies, themes, and approaches		
Overview		
Key Evaluation Questions		PowerPoint Slides
Utilization Focused Evaluation (UFE)		PowerPoint slides, IDRC, Sarah Earl, Evaluation Unit
Provincial Breakdown of CP Grant Recipients 2005-2009		Excel spreadsheet

Document Title	Date	Description of Document
Approaches		
PARTNERSHIPS Canadian Partnerships' work with Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)	Feb. 2009	Draft document examining CP's work with civil society organisations (CSOs)
Canadian Partnerships work in collaboration with ROs and other PIs 1995-2008	Aug. 20, 08	Document examining CP's collaboration with other Program initiatives and Regional Offices
Thematic papers		
Thematic Overview: Corporate Social Responsibility, CSR, SID-CP and the Extractive Industries	March 2009	Compiled as a contribution to CP corporate memory and External Review Excerpt
Thematic Overview: Indigenous People, Rights and Knowledge: Determining their own development	March 2009	Compiled as a contribution to CP corporate memory and External Review Excerpt
Chapter 1 – What is outcome mapping? document 3 of 12	August 8, 2009	Book excerpt
Le CRDI et l'Université Carleton		Newsletter
IDRC and the University of Alberta		Newsletter
Tapping diasporas for development		Author of article James Boothroyd
Determining their own development: Canadian Partnerships and indigenous Issues: 1995 to 2008, Simms, Meghan, J. Marcil and G. Morin-Labatut,	2009	IDRC Canadian Partnerships Program Thematic Overview: Indigenous People, Rights and Knowledge, IDRC
Working Papers		
External Reviews of IDRD Programs: Scope of Work	Updated Dec. 10, 2008	Prepared by the Evaluation Unit
North-South Research Partnership Challenges, Responses and Trends	May 2007	CP Working Paper #1 North-South Research Partnerships, Literature Review – two copies
On the agenda: North-South Research Partnership and agenda setting processes	August 2007	CP Working Paper #2 North-South Research Partnerships
Partner Category: YOUTH Canadian Passport, Global Citizenship: Engaging Young Canadians in an Interconnected World	Updated 2007	
The North South Institute, Research for a Fairer World Institutional Evaluation	February 2009	For The use of IDRC CP external reviewers only,
Methodology for the Evaluation of the In-Focus Projects	January 2007	In collaboration with New Economy Development Group Inc.
On the agenda: North-South research partnerships and agenda-setting processes, Bradley, Megan	2007	Canadian Partnerships Working Paper #2, IDRC
North-South Research Partnerships: Challenges, Responses and Trends: A Literature Review and Annotated Bibliography, Bradley, Megan	2007	Canadian Partnerships Program, IDRC
The Social Economy in Development: Six Billion Stakeholders, Simms, Meghan, J. Marcil and G. Morin-Labatut	2009	Compiled as a contribution to CP corporate memory and External Review, IDRC (unpublished)
CSR, SID-CP and the Extractive Industries, Simms, Meghan, J. Marcil and G. Morin-Labatut	2009	IDRC Canadian Partnerships Program Thematic Overview: Corporate Social Responsibility, IDRC
OTHER		
IDRC Research Support Project #104755	May 2009	Consolidation of Global Network for IDS, application already approved
IDRD Award Project 105087	Nov. 2008	Global Citizenship Small Grants Program 2008-2009, Application already approved

Document Title	Date	Description of Document
IDRC Research Project 102341	June 2009	AUCC Partnership Grant: 2004-2006, Application Already Approved
IDRC Research Project 103842	May 2009	Creating Global Citizens: Impact of Volunteering/Work Abroad Programs, application already approved
IDRC Research Project 103097	May 2009	Rethinking Development: Local Pathways to Global Wellbeing Conference June 2005, application already approved
IDRC Research Project 103459	May 2009	Communicating Seed Knowledge (India and Nepal), application already approved
IDRD Award Project 104387	Aug. 2008	Canadian Partnerships on Global and Emerging Issues: 2007-2008, application already approved
IDRD Award Project 104387	May 2009	Canadian Partnerships on Global and Emerging Issues: 2007-2008, Project Approval Document
IDRD Award Project 105088	Nov. 2008	Canadian Partnerships on Global and Emerging Issues: 2008-2009, application already approved
IDRC Award Project 104386	Feb 2008	Global Citizenship Small Grants 2007-2008, Project Approval Document
CP Grant Recipients 2002-2009		Excel table, 2002-2009
CP SGP Internal Routing Form	June 2007	Project Type: SGP Global Citizenship, File # 104386-027
CP SGP Internal Routing Form	Sept 2007	Project Type: SGP CP for Global and Emerging Issues, File # 105088-014
RPE External Website Evaluation appendices	Nov. 2008	Appendices 1 - 11
3. External project and program evaluations, any available monitoring data at the program level		
Organizational Assessment of the Canadian Association for the Study of International Development (CASID)	January 2007	External evaluation: Final (revised) report UNIVERSALIA
Institutional and Program Evaluation: The CCIC Evaluation Report	June 2006	For CIDA, by E.T. Jackson and Associates.
Developing a Theory of Change Logic Model for Your Program: Drawing a picture of why your program should succeed (Chapter 3)		"Produced" by The W.K. Kellogg Foundation pages Pages 65-72
Introduction and Overview Dottridge, T.	March 11, 2009,	(presentation to External Review Team) PowerPoint presentation. IDRC, Ottawa.
External Reviews of IDRC Programs,	March 11 and 12, 2009	Evaluation Unit, PowerPoint presentation to Orientation and Methodology Workshop for external review team, Canadian Partnerships Program
External Reviews of IDRC Programs: Scope of Work	December 10, 2008	Evaluation Unit, IDRC
Participatory Research and Development: An Analysis of IDRC's Experience and Prospects, Found, W.,	1995	Ottawa, International Development Research Centre
External Evaluation of the Rural Poverty and Environment (RPE) Program	November 2008	Final Report, for IDRC
External Review of the IDRC Ecohealth Program Initiative: Final Review Report,	November 2008	External Review, IDRC
Annexes to the Final Review Report, External Review of the IDRC Ecohealth Program Initiative	November 2008	External Review, IDRC
Addressing the Question of Attribution in Evaluation	March 2004	Evaluation Highlight document #1
The Sustainability of IDRC-Supported Networks	March 2005	Evaluation Highlight document #3
Capacities, Contexts, Conditions: The Influence of IDRC – Supported Research on Policy Processes, Fred Carden	March 2004	Evaluation Highlight document #5
Capacity Building Strategic Evaluation, Phase 1 and 2, Background to Study	April 2006	Evaluation Highlight document #10
Working Together to Strengthen Skills	March 2007	Evaluation Highlight document #13
Working Together to Strengthen Skills, In Individuals	May 2007	Evaluation Highlight document #14

Document Title	Date	Description of Document
Working Together to Strengthen Skills, In Organizations	May 2007	Evaluation Highlight document #15
Working Together to Strengthen Skills, In Networks	May 2007	Evaluation Highlight document #16
IDRC Strategic Evaluation, Capacity Development	November 2008	Evaluation Document
The Sustainability of Networks: An Analysis of the Findings from an IDRC Strategic Evaluation (1995-2005)	October 2006	Report, Willard and Creech
Institutional Evaluation of the Canadian Council of Area Studies Learned Societies for the International Development Research Centre	October 2008	External evaluation: Final report, SOUTH HOUSE
Canadian Council of Areas Studies Learned Societies (CCASLS) Operational Review Final Report	September 2006	Operational review: Final report
Evaluation of the Canada-Latin America and the Caribbean Research Exchange Grants Programme (LACREG)	March 2009	Program evaluation: Final report
Team biographies		
T. Dottridge, Gisèle Morin-Labatut, Luc Mougeot		Position descriptions for listed persons
The Significance of Feminist Analysis in North-South Relations: Exploring the links among organizational principles, international partnerships and program results	July 2008	Proposal submitted to CP, SID, PPB, IDRC, Ottawa
OTHER EXTERNAL NON-IDRC		
Application for a Development Research Education/Institutional Cooperation Grant	April 19, 2009	To Claire Thompson, IDRC, from Henry Veltmeyer,
Youth Services and Support in Britannia Woods: an Action Research Project		Pamphlet
Canadian Partnerships Global and Emerging Issues SGP Internal Routing Form	July 14, 2009	
Kairos, Analyse Strategique	May 2007	Newsletter, KAIROS (French)
Kairos, Policy Briefing Paper: Bolivia Emulates Norway: Why Doesn't Canada?	October 2006	Newsletter, KAIROS
KAIROS: Policy Briefing Paper: Seven Steps for Peace in Darfur	February 2007	Newsletter, KAIROS
KAIROS: Policy Briefing Paper: Measuring the Federal Government's Commitment to Aboriginal Rights	December 2006	Newsletter, KAIROS
KAIROS: Policy Briefing Paper: Free Trade at the Crossroads	December 2006	Newsletter, KAIROS
KAIROS: Policy Briefing Paper: Canadian Security: security for all of us	February 2006	Newsletter, KAIROS
KAIROS: Policy Briefing Paper: Will US debt lead to a financial crisis	February 2006	Newsletter, KAIROS
KAIROS: Policy Briefing Paper: Will democracy take root in the Congo	October 2006	Newsletter, KAIROS
Determining their own development 1995-2008		Compiled as a contribution to CP Corporate memory and external review excerpt
The Social Economy in Development, Six Billion Stakeholders,	March 2009	Excerpt from "compiled as a contribution to CP corporate memory and External Review
Participatory Action Research	August 9, 2009	From Wikipedia
A Short Note on Participatory Research	August 9, 2009	Caledonia.org.uk/research.htm
From Clients to Citizens: Deepening the Practice of Asset-Based and Citizen-Led Development	July 2009	Brochure produced by Coady International Institute
These are our crimes	2004 05	Annual Report, book form of people in exile
MiningWatch Canada, Annual Report 2008	Dec. 2008	Annual Report
On the Ground: Communities and Mining in Canada and the world 2007-2009 Proposal to	June 2007	From MiningWatch Canada

Document Title	Date	Description of Document
IDRC,		
CPI Atlantic	March 2005	Addressed to Gisele Morin-LaBatut
Insights: Between Hope and Scepticism: Civil Society and the African Peer Review Mechanism.	Oct. 2005	Partnership Africa Canada, Ousmane Deme, bound book
Recent Publications from Partnership Africa Canada	Nov. 2007	Information Sheet
Insights: The Heart of the Matter: Sierra Leone, Diamonds and Human Security	Jan 2000	Ian Smillie, Lansana Gberie, Ralph Hazleton
Partnership Africa Canada, Year in Review 2007	Jan 2008	Brochure
Internationalizing Canadian Campuses	2007	AUCC, Scotiabank – Information packet
Institutional Evaluation of the Canadian Council of Area Studies Learned Societies	Oct. 2008	For IDRC, by South House Exchange, Kate McLaren and Paul Turcot. Final Report
On the Road to Democratic Governance: Highlights of the 2007 Students for Development Program	2008	Students for Development, AUCC, Ottawa
Highlighting the impacts of North-South research collaboration among Canadian and southern higher education partners”	June 2006	AUCC, Ottawa
UniWorld,	issues for October, 2007; March, 2009; October, 2008; March, 2009:	AUCC, Ottawa
Policy dialogue on recognition and reward of Canadian university faculty involved in international research collaboration for development: Summary of outcomes	2008	AUCC, Ottawa
Policy dialogue on fostering effective engagement of Canadian university Diaspora faculty in international research collaboration for development: Summary of outcomes	2008	AUCC, Ottawa
Profiling the impacts of North-South research collaboration for development	2006	AUCC, Ottawa
Internationalizing Canadian campuses: Main themes emerging from the 2007 Scotiabank-AUCC workshop on excellence in internationalization at Canadian universities	2007	AUCC, Ottawa
Annual Report, CIGI, Waterloo	2008	Centre for International Governance Innovation, CIGI
CIGI partnerships with the Global South, (Alison De Muy to Paul Heinbecker)	April 2008	CIGI Memo
CIGI-IDRC Points of Collaboration	January, 2008	CIGI Memo
Final Report: Research Without (Southern) Borders: The Changing Canadian Research Landscape	2003	A national roundtable on new direction in international research in Canada, May 22-23, 2003), AUCC, Ottawa
Canadian Partnerships, Special Initiatives Program, CAID	January 17/18, 1994	A Discussion Paper

Revised September 10, 2009

Annex J: OUTCOME FRAMEWORK MATRIX

Objectives	Activities and Outputs (Program level services provided by CP)
1. To build and maintain the Centre's long term relationship with key Canadian institutions	1. regular communication between members of the IDRC CP Team and representatives from key Canadian institutions – strong communication links 2. a pattern of regular funding support from the CP Program to specific Canadian institutions – reliable funding mechanisms 3. Access to networks – growth in linkages 4. sharing of advice and knowledge 5. keeping abreast of emerging trends and sharing new ideas 6. developing common agendas or strategic plans
2. To strengthen the capacity and engagement of Canadian universities, research institutions and civil society organizations to address international development questions through research, knowledge sharing and networking	1. seek out and communicate with Canadian universities, research institutions and civil society organizations – contact with potential partners 2. provide support (monetary and other), contacts and suggestions to partners 3. offer access to networks and contact with other researchers in North and South 4. open access to body of research and knowledge around international development issues
3. To facilitate and strengthen mutually beneficial Canada-Global South connections through collaborative research, knowledge sharing and networking	1. maintain a broad network of southern partners 2. initiate contact between southern and northern partners where appropriate 3. share research findings and information with partners both north and south 4. facilitate exchange between participants from organizations in both north and south 5. facilitate awareness of emerging development trends & issues
4. To increase the number of Canadians learning about and engaging with international development issues through their participation in knowledge production and sharing activities	1. sponsor attendance at forums, conferences, seminars and workshops in both the north and the south 2. offer opportunities for exchange visits in both the north and the south 3. document and publish stories on international development issues
5. To contribute to realizing the Centre's strategic vision with respect to Canadian institutions by exploring and documenting innovative partner mechanisms	1. seek out and support innovative partnership proposals from Canadian institutions 2. keep abreast of emerging trends and share findings 3. develop risk strategy to enable risk taking within defined parameters 4. document and disseminate results of innovative partner mechanisms

Expected Outcomes (what is hoped will result from the Program level CP services)	Indicators (acknowledgement and response to services by users)
Key Canadian institutions most closely related to the Centre's mandate and mission will have strengthened their capacity, as convenors, coordinators and users of multi-institutional initiatives to generate, share or use knowledge on international development issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. evidence that on-going communication strengthens partnership 2. funding mechanisms in place over a defined period leads to trust 3. linkages between Canadian institutions and relevant Canadian and international networks are established 4. ongoing exchange of ideas, feedback and advice between institutions 5. exchange of ideas regarding emerging trends 6. cooperation in pursuit of common goals and strategic plans
Canadian universities, research institutions and civil society organizations will have integrated or mainstreamed in various degrees, attention to international development questions in their research, information sharing or utilization activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. active outreach to Canadian institutions to provide added focus and depth to ID research, information sharing or utilization 2. Indications of appropriate monetary and other support 3. access to networks and researchers facilitated 4. Guidance towards high quality research in international development, as well as information sharing & utilization activities
Canadian and Southern partner institutions and organizations will have benefited in several ways from connections facilitated or supported between them	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Connections between partners (north and south) facilitated by CP are acknowledged. Concrete benefits described 2. new North-South relationships have been forged through CP support 3. training received and research findings exchanged 4. demonstrated exchanges between North and South 5. Research findings produced and disseminated
The Centre's strategic vision with respect to Canadian institutions will have found new ways of expressing itself through innovative partner mechanisms	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. evidence of risk taking around unusual or new initiatives partnership initiatives 2. presence of genuinely innovative partnerships 3. demonstrated risk management 4. stories documenting innovative partnerships produced and disseminated